

967

A
LETTER
TO THE
AUTHOR
OF A LATE
EPISTOLARY DISSERTATION.



A
L E T T E R
T O T H E
A U T H O R
O F A L A T E
E P I S T O L A R Y D I S S E R T A T I O N .

Addressed to Mr. *WARBURTON*.

W H E R E I N

All his O B J E C T I O N S to Mr. *Warburton's*
Interpretation of the *Command to Abraham*
to offer up his Son Isaac, are considered.

By *L. U. P.* ----- A. M.

L O N D O N ,

Printed for M. COOPER, at the *Globe* in *Pater-*
Noster-Row.

M D C C X L I V .

(Price one Shilling.)

488



A
L E T T E R
T O T H E
A U T H O R
O F A L A T E
E P I S T O L A R Y D I S S E R T A T I O N.

S I R,

W H O you are, I do not certainly know, or if I did, I would not chuse to direct to you by your Name, as you have not thought fit to give it us yourself: Common Fame, I find, has pronounced you to be a Name justly of great Distinction in the learned World; and herein very far be it from me to dispute its Judgment: But I cannot bring myself to think, with a great many, your late Attacks on Mr. *Warburton*, in the *Epistolary Dissertation* which you address to him, and the *Appendix* to it, have done Execution: In my humble Opinion, your Cause is extremely bad, and most untenable in both its Parts ;

B
else,

else, no doubt, you would have made much better of both, than you seem to me to have done of either. As to that Part, wherein you take to Task Mr. *W——n*'s second Proposition in his projected *Demonstration of the Divine Legation of Moses*; as I thought it was not unlikely he would, I find, he has, himself, spared a few Hours to confute it: I shall therefore not meddle with it. But there not being the same Reason against my answering the other, I will humbly presume on your Patience, while I endeavour to bring you into my Opinion of it: To convince you of the sure Truth both of Mr. *W——n*'s Interpretation of *the Command to Abraham to offer his Son Isaac*, and also of the Uses he makes of it, and you have impugned; that such is this his Cause in both its Parts, and so well sustained by him, that all your Attempts on them, and on his Proofs of them, have failed of making the least Impression on either any where. And not to detain you any longer with Prefacing, I'll immediately enter on my proposed Work. I shall first endeavour to vindicate against you Mr. *W——n*'s Interpretation of the Command in Question; and then the Consequences he has deduced from it.

He lays his Foundation in a Text in the New Testament. This Text, he shews,^a affirms, That *Abraham* had a visible Representation of the Redemption of Mankind by the Sacrifice of *Christ*; and if this Sacrifice was revealed to him, he proves,^b by two different

^a Vol. II. p. 593, 594. ^b P. 594—596.

Mediums, that that Revelation is recorded in Scripture : Then, having thus far cleared the Way, he proceeds ^c to shew,

1. That there is no Place in the whole History of *Abraham* but this, where he is commanded to offer up his Son, which bears the least Traces of such a Revelation.

2. That this Command has all the Marks of, and is indeed that Revelation.

It is true indeed, the First of these Propositions is only one necessary Complement of what had been hitherto proved, in order to establish this Conclusion, That the Command to *Abraham* to sacrifice his Son, was a visible Representation, or an Information of Him by Action of our Redemption by the Sacrifice of *Christ* : But the other, besides being the last and compleat Finishing of that Argument, is also a direct Proof, of itself, of the same Conclusion, independently of any Assistance which it receives from the New Testament. Accordingly Mr. *W*——, in strength of what he has advanced under it, thus expresses himself, in the summing up of the whole Argument : “ This History not only easily and naturally “ admits of such a Sense, but *demands* it ^d.”

Nevertheless, I find, you think very differently of this Matter. For after you have disprov'd, as you think, his Interpretation of our Saviour's Words alledged by him as asserting, That *Abraham* saw a visible Representation of the Sacrifice of *Christ*, you express

^c Page 596.

^d P. 697.

yourself in the following Words : “ Here
 “ then, Sir, your Argument must necessarily
 “ have its Period ; for this Text stands as the
 “ FOUNDATION of all that follows ; the
 “ Tendency of which is only to shew, that
 “ (ADMITTING, or ALLOWING that *Abraham*
 “ was acquainted with the great Sacrifice of
 “ *Christ*) — it is reasonable to expect an Ac-
 “ count of it in his History ; that — there is
 “ no Place in the History of *Abraham* but
 “ this, where he was commanded to sacrifice
 “ his Son, which has the least Marks or
 “ Traces of such a Revelation ; that — this
 “ Transaction stands in the very Place where
 “ one would naturally expect to find this Re-
 “ velation ; that — this Way of Information
 “ by Action, is agreeable to the Method of
 “ Providence in other Cases ; and was most
 “ apposite to convey the Information intended.
 “ This, Sir, is the Substance of what occurs
 “ between p. 594, and 608. But all this I
 “ must set aside, as not *pertinent*, till your
 “ first Point is establish’d upon surer Grounds.”

Thus you. And I do not pretend that you
 have defalcated or unfairly represented any Part
 of what occurs from p. 594 to 602, where he
 enters on the second Proposition, which he had
 formally proposed, and is set down above ; of
 his ingenious Performance, under which, to
 p. 608, I will humbly presume to give some-
 what a larger Account, than your, very con-
 cise indeed Summary is : Previous whereto it

may not be amiss just to mention, That the Truth of *Abraham's* History, and all God's other recorded Revelations to him, are admitted in the Dispute between Mr. *W——* and the Infidels. They must consequently admit “ *Abraham's* personal Character, together
 “ with the Choice made of him for Head and
 “ Origin of that People, which God would
 “ make holy and separate to himself, from
 “ whence was to arise the *Redeemer* of Man-
 “ kind, the ultimate End of the Separation.” Is it not, therefore, probable, that the Knowledge of this *Redeemer* would be revealed to him? “ *Shall I hide from Abraham the Thing which I do?*” says God, in a Matter “ that much less concerned the *Father of the*
 “ *Faithful.*” It must likewise be admitted that God had expressly revealed himself to him, and made him the following Promise: *I will make of thee a great Nation, and I will bless thee and make thy Name great, and thou shalt be a Blessing. And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all the Families of the Earth be blessed.* Would not then God acquaint this so extraordinary Favourite wherein this great Blessing of making all the Families of the Earth happy in him consisted? He gave him a very particular and exact Account how the other general Blessing was to be accomplished, in the Manner and by the Steps and Degrees related by *Moses*. Would he not also grant

† Gen. xviii. 17. ‡ Gen. xii. 2, 3.

him the same Satisfaction with regard to this? This, to which the other was subservient and only a Means? Is it possible to believe but he would, without fail, do this, after he had raised his Expectation, and excited a proportionable Desire; by so precisely fixing every Particular with regard to the other; by a gradual and complete Opening to this great View; by a gradual and orderly leading to this important End; by bringing the Matter nearer and nearer to his personal Interest, and more and more forcibly moving his natural Affection? No impartial Man can, I am persuaded, consider these Things, and make the least Doubt but that God would and did give *Abraham* the Revelation spoken of: And this is the only End I proposed in advancing them. One Part of what has been said, is in a few Lines laid down by Mr. *W*—— immediately before he enters on his Consideration of the Words of our Saviour in St. *John's* Gospel, in which he places the Foundation of his *Thesis*^h: And the rest is in the following Argumentsⁱ, of which I am going to give an Abstract. But the Questions in it offered themselves on laying down the previous Observation; and I shall not forget that I have already proposed them, in dis-

^h Page 592.

ⁱ Which are contained in Page 602—607. All here said to be in those Pages is very plainly expressed and implied in them, especially if they are not considered in a detached Condition, but what precedes be remembered; besides that every Part of it appears sufficiently in other Parts of this his *Case of Abraham*, &c.

charging the Part now to be entered on. The Arguments I shall repeat very imperfectly (setting aside the Omissions in Consequence of what has been already done) prove principally, that the Command to offer up *Isaac*, was a Revelation to *Abraham* of the Sacrifice of *Christ* for the Redemption of all Men; not on Supposition of the Truth of the Conclusion already sufficiently evinced; but they include, and prove it also. They are of two Sorts, both negative and positive; and Mr. *W*—— begins with the first of these.

The other Interpretation, which makes the Command to be given to *Abraham*, only to *try* him (*viz.* with respect to him himself) must needs sink under the following Absurdities. Whereas all God's other Revelations to *Abraham*, even to this last, though they relate primarily indeed to his Posterity according to the Flesh, do yet respect ultimately the whole Race of Mankind; and therefore one would naturally expect to find this last, the Confirmation and Completion of the rest; this Opinion makes it to have no manner of Relation to them, but to be foreign to every thing preceding.

When the great *Searcher of Hearts* is pleased to *try* any of his Servants, either for Example sake, or for some other End favourable of his Dispensations to Mankind, as in this he condescends to the Manner of Men, who cannot judge of their inferior Agents without Trial; so we may be assured he would accommodate

moderate himself to their manner likewise in the most material Circumstance of their *Trial*. Let us then apply our Ideas of Things to the *Trial*, for the sake of which alone the Opinion under Confutation makes this Command to be given: Instead of being most exactly agreeable to, it is expressly contradictory of them; it is not made, either in order to *Abraham's* being set on *any Work*, or receiving *any Reward*, in Case he answered: No, we are told, that the *Trial* was made after all his Work was done, and all God's Mercies conferred; *and it came to pass after these Things*. — Nay, what is still more strange, after he had been *once tried* already. That indeed it was a *Trial*, the sacred Text assures us; and, directly contrary to the Case in the other Interpretation, wherein neither any Commission or *Trust*, nor *Reward*, is *consequent* on it; Mr. *W* — *n's*, as we shall see, makes a *Benefit* to depend on, and be necessarily connected with it; and the *efo'e* it must needs be the true.

The following direct Signs and Evidences do also put it beyond all reasonable Exception: This Command succeeds a Series of Revelations, which are throughout a gradual Opening, and fit Preparation for some future Revelation, which, in Pursuance of this regular Scheme of progressive Dispensations, could be no other than that of the *Redemption of Mankind by the Messiah*, the Completion of the whole of God's Oeconomy, and the Explanation

tion of his first and fundamental Revelation, *that in Abraham should all the Families of the Earth be blessed*; and there was no other Revelation, that we read of, after this in *Abraham's* History. This Command therefore is the very Revelation which we seek; the Revelation which perfects all the foregoing, and makes the whole Series uniform and complete. And the Place in which we find it, exactly suits such a Revelation, which, being the Completion of the rest, must needs be the last in Order.

When *Abraham* had Reason to expect, and his Desires were inflamed, by all possible Motives, to be informed *how* all Mankind were to be blessed in him, then came this Command to him, to offer his Son. Who then can think but it is the Revelation which he so wanted? I think too, I may add another Fitness or two of this Information in the Height of *Abraham's* Impatience and Eagerness to have it, supposing his offering his Son to be that Revelation, not expressly mentioned by Mr. *Warburton*. This his Ardency would very naturally suggest, and was a very convenient Representation to him of the extreme Love and Desire with which God offered up his Son for the Salvation of Men.

Mr. *Warburton's* Interpretation of this Command dispels all that Perplexity (taken Notice of above) in our Ideas of a Trial, on the common Interpretation. For admit it, and the *Trial*, as is fit, *precedes* the last and great-

est Favour ever bestowed by God on *Abraham*. And may it not be added, *Abraham's* extreme longing for it, was an admirable Enhancement, and the complete Perfection of it?

Instruction by *Action* was of frequent Use in Antiquity in personal Conferences, long after all other Necessity had ceased for it, than for the sake of the stronger Impression Motion, naturally significative, and entering in at the Eye, is fitted to make, than any arbitrary Signs to convey through the Ears. And God very frequently vouchsafed, in Compliance to a general Custom, to use this Way of Information, when he instructed the holy Patriarchs and Prophets in his Will.

And, as the high Importance of this Revelation required its being given in the strong and forcible Way of *Action*; so nothing can be conceived more apposite to convey the Information than *this very Action*. It is indeed very affectingly surprizing, even to us, and at this Distance of Time after it, to see how excellently adapted both the *Action* itself, and all its *Circumstances*, were to this End; of making it a Representation to *Abraham*, of the whole of God's Redemption of us by the Sacrifice of his only Begotten.

What has been said, is indeed that which it gave out to be, a very incomplete Account of those Arguments which Mr. *Warburton* has urged, with all possible Advantage, in Maintenance of the Proposition, 'tis needless to repeat

peat. And yet I cannot but think, that, even from hence alone, it is manifest, contrary to what you assert, both that That, which you give as the Substance of the Pages in his Book referred to by you, falls very short of it, and is indeed nothing like it, with regard to this Part; and also, that this Proposition is not of Service to his Cause, only in Consequence of the Truth of his Interpretation of what he alledges out of the *New Testament*: But is, of itself, a very sufficient Proof, That the Command to *Abraham* to offer his Son, was a Representation to *Him* of the great Sacrifice of *Christ*, not only independently of any thing in the *New Testament*; but also setting aside any of the other Assistances and Supports of it, which occur in Mr. *Warburton's* Prosecution of other immediate Ends, both before and after it. And therefore I shall not stand here to give these last named Particulars, and additional Confirmations of this Conclusion: Especially as such of your Objections as I shall think it will be proper to answer in this Place to any of the foregoing Proofs, and to the Conclusion itself, will call for many of them; and then they shall have them, as I hope, to their complete Satisfaction, and to the Shame of your Cause, and your present Misapplication of Talents, you are said to possess.

It may be thought Presumption in me to pass any Judgment of any Thing of yours. But yet I cannot help declaring, before I propose your mentioned Objections, that, in my

Opinion, you have acquitted yourself not much amiss in so bad a Cause, at least in this Part of your Performance, if indeed a Man can acquit himself tolerably, except in a much better Cause than it is. And I cannot but think, and sometimes say to myself, it is a Pity you should undertake Causes which must miserably disappoint and defeat the best Skill and Abilities. Alas! Sir, *Milo's* Strength was Weakness itself against a certain Tree he was once so imprudent to encounter. What have You here done against your most judicious great Adversary, and certain Truth?

After having evaded contending with any of the very many strong direct Arguments, of which some Account has been given above, besides others, by the sham Pretence of giving that for the whole Substance of them, which is really a small, or rather no Part at all of them, and making them to be nothing to the purpose; you having deprived them of that Ground, on Supposition only of the Sureness whereof they make any thing to it: You tell us, that the last Step Mr. *Warburton* takes in this Argument, is to raise Objections against the common Account of this History, in order to draw an Inference from thence, that his Account must be the true; and this, you immediately add, you will consider^a. I have perused your Considerations; and find, that, by the last Step you say Mr. *Warburton* takes in Support of his Interpretation of the Command to

^a See p. 149.

Abraham, you mean the Arguments by which he, *first of all*, proves, that this Command not only easily and naturally admits, but requires the Sense asserted by him of it. These two different negative Proofs, touched on above, you jumble together, and confound into one, the latter of them. Then against this you proceed with all the Formality of regular Approaches, and according to the Rules of Art; and indeed you do not only threaten, but you almost seem to do something; but this is all but Semblance of Worth; utterly vain is your Attempt, and there is nothing done, or can be done in it. We will see if it be not so.

This one, and not the most considerable Argument of those of the weakest kind Mr. *Warburton* has advanced, which you have singled out, whereon to display your polemical Skill, and discharge Volleys of Objections at, very thick indeed, one after another, stands briefly thus: The other Interpretation, which, or this must be admitted, makes the Command to be given *only* for the sake of *trying Abraham*; and yet neither to be previous to the entrusting him with any *Work*, nor in order to any *Reward*; which this makes attendant on the Trial, holy Scripture does assure us it was. And this just State of it, as it stands in Mr. *Warburton's* Book, especially with what will be said in the Course of our Argument with you on this Head, is sufficient to satisfy you with

how little Reason you strongly intimate, at least, as if he had given it an unskilful Direction.—To prevent Confusion, as you say, in the Question between you, you observe that the common Interpretation does not make the Command in Question to have been given as a Trial ONLY. God's Intention in this Command, according to it, was not only to try *Abraham*, but also to PREFIGURE *the Sacrifice of Christ*^c. But, Sir, this last End, as you make it, did not respect *Abraham*; but future Ages; and so the common Interpretation makes the *trying* of *Abraham* to be the *only* End with regard to *him*, to whom this Command was a principal Dispensation on both Interpretations; and whom Mr. *Warburton*, as it was proper he should, only considered; as any Body, of very moderate Penetration, could not but have clearly discerned, who had not turned his Mind constantly to picking Cavils. It is not only indisputably true, but not disputed by you, that the *trying* of *Abraham* was the *only* End of the Command with respect to *him*, in your Interpretation; and consequently without you can account for the Propriety of of its being so, on our Ideas of Things, that Interpretation must needs fall; unless you can make it appear, not an high Solecism for the All-wise, All-powerful God, to lay such an Injunction as this Command, on purpose to *try* him, without any Reason for his doing this, only for the sake of a remote secondary

End, to be answered some thousands of Years afterwards; and an End too, which might certainly have been equally answered without this: Not to add, that the History itself sufficiently shews, that your Interpretation is false, which makes the Command to be given for the sake *only* of *trying Abraham*. For it does not say, God gave it *to tempt Abraham*; but it stands thus: *And it came to pass after these Things, that God did tempt Abraham, and said: — Take now thy Son, &c.*

Nevertheless, I think too well of the Person many take you for, not to have the Curiosity to see how you have performed, supposing yourself on the Advantage Ground you endeavoured to gain, though with such bad Success; but without, however, foregoing that which has been kept against you. You do not pretend, that the Trial in the Command, was in order to the committing any *Business* to *Abraham*; but you say *Abraham* lived long after it to enjoy many *Blessings* in this Life^d. And not only this is very true; but he was also blessed in his Posterity; which you might as well have observed Sir: But were nor all the Blessings and Mercies he enjoyed to the End of his Life, and his Descendants after him, *given* him by God long *before* this Trial? And therefore this is nothing to your purpose. You prove nothing, unless you prove, that *Abraham* reaped some particular Advantages, enjoyed some Blessings, not only subsequent to, or after, but *consequent* on this Trial, on your

Interpretation ; as it is past Dispute he did on Mr. *Warburton's*. And this, it is plain, you never can be able to do ; because after this Trial, God only repeated the old Blessings, without any Addition to them. Indeed as *Abraham* had justly forfeited the Mercies before granted him, if he had not, not only walked in the Laws of his Lord blameless, but also answered this Trial ; so it was very natural, according to our Ideas of Things, for God to renew and confirm them on his answering so as he did : but which it equally contradicts, to suppose *a Trial* was made of *Abraham*, to have an Occasion to repeat Blessings, which he had already *received* ; much more, that the Command was given for no other End, than *only* to be *a Trial* for the sake of this Occasion, that is, for nothing in Effect.

What if, on Supposition the Command was not the Information asserted by Mr. *Warburton*, there were no Blessings, with regard to this Life, consequent on it ? You are in a very great Surprise, “ that he should argue so “ weakly, as if the Reward of good Men had “ a Respect to this Life only.” Truly Mr. *Warburton* then, I can tell him, was very sure to be wondered at on this Occasion. For I should have been very much indeed surprized to hear, he had taken into Account *future Rewards*, which he has proved to be designedly concealed from the *Jews*, for whose sake, more immediately, *Moses* wrote his five

Books; and therefore, it is certain, there would be nothing in them that is utterly irreconcilable to Mens Ideas of Things, without Recourse to these Rewards. Let it be observed that the *Jews* did, or might know, in general, by the Reasoning used above, or the like, that the Transaction was a Representation to their Father *Abraham* of the Completion of the great Promise, of blessing all Mankind in him; which Sight *many Prophets and Kings desired to see*, and did *not*; and which every one must needs apprehend as a very extraordinary Privilege and Favour. And this Observation I have made, to obviate an Objection, which else might arise in the Minds of some Readers, though I cannot think you can be so weak as to be subject to it. But you deny this Point, that the *Jews* of *Moses's* Time were kept in Ignorance of a future State of Rewards and Punishments. I might very well content myself with this Answer, that with what little Reason you have contested Mr. *Warburton's* really unexceptionable Proof of it, surely no rational Person can make the least Doubt, is certainly most manifest from the few Strictures he has made on this your Attempt, which will very soon be published. But whether you will admit this, or not, I'll try to force you, nevertheless, to a Confession, that a *State of future Rewards and Punishments* must be left out of the Question, in accounting for the Trial the Command was of *Abraham*. But, in order to this End, it will be proper to pre-

D mise,

mise, that you own this State is no Part of the *Mosaical* Dispensation; that *future Rewards and Punishments* are no Sanctions of any of his Laws, never referred to in them; for you say, *Moses*, as Legislator, had no Commission to propound them^f. Very well: Had they been much made use of, much spoken of in the Law, there had indeed been less Occasion: But since there was no Recourse to, no Notice taken of them in that Law; to which nothing was to be added, and which held out worldly Goods and Evils to their constant Attention (as proceeding from God indeed, in Reward or Punishment of their obeying or transgressing his Will;) certainly *Moses* would have been very full of them, have taken all Occasions of expressing, and recommending them to Notice in his History-part, if he had designed the *Jews* should have believed them, have been influenced by, or paid any Regard to them. Or, at least, wherever we find them not, there is no Place for them, or else some cogent Reason for omitting them. But what Reason could there be, never to refer to them in all *Abraham's* History, unless the Historian's Design was to exhibit all the Instances of his Obedience, as obtaining a Recompence in this Life? What Reason could he have to omit them, after *Abraham's* answering this Trial, but to direct the *Jews* to the Reward of it in the Transaction itself? In one Word, if it was not ne-

^f In *Epist. Dissert.*

cessary

cessary *Moses* should say nothing of future Rewards and Punishments, so as to be taken notice of, and understood any where, it is most undeniable he would have mentioned these Rewards here; since he so fully repeats the old Blessings God was pleased to re-assure *Abraham* of after the Trial; if God had not known it was accountable, and designed it to be accounted for without them. And this it is plainly impossible to be, either to *Jews* or *Christians*, but on Mr. *Warburton's* Interpretation of the Command.

You tell us, *Abraham* had been *tried* more than ONCE before this *Trial*; and then you subjoin: "What if, after all this, the Wisdom
 " of God should have thought fit, that this
 " very Man, whom he had singled out to be
 " an eminent Example of Piety to all Genera-
 " tions, should, at the very Close of his Life,
 " give Evidence of it by an Instance, that ex-
 " ceeded all that had gone before; that he
 " might be a Pattern of *patient suffering* even
 " unto the End?" I answer, *Abraham* was never designed to be set forth as an Instance of *patient Suffering*, without a consequent Reward in this Life, in Consequence of what I have just now said, in Answer to your having Recourse to the next for a Recompence of his Faith and Obedience in the *Trial* treating of, which else will be sought in vain on your Interpretation of the Command. Besides, in full Confutation both of that, and the present Eva-

^s *Append. p. 153.*

sion, please to observe, that after this Trial it is said: *And the Lord HAD blessed Abraham IN ALL THINGS*; in *this Trial*, therefore, as well as in every Thing else.

Mr. *Warburton* observed, that *Abraham* had been tried *once* before this Trial, plainly with this View, to heighten the Absurdity of imagining that he should undergo this, unless in order either to setting him on some *Work*, or conferring some *Favour* on him. But if, as you say, he had been tried more than once before, that may perhaps be thought to weaken this Corroboration of Mr. *Warburton's* Argument. But, pray, what other Trial was made before of him, besides that mentioned by Mr. *Warburton*?
 “ It was a *Trial* of his *Faith*, and his *Virtue*
 “ too, when he was called upon to leave his
 “ *Kindred, and his Father's House, to sojourn*
 “ *in a strange Land*^h.” His doing this was nothing else but a necessary Obedience of a convenient Command, given without any View of trying, or indeed being any *Trial* of him, any otherwise than as every not very agreeable Duty, in itself, which, in the Course of a virtuous Life, unavoidably happens to every One, is. But the Instance mentioned by Mr. *Warburton*, was a *formal Trial*; and accordingly, after it, it is expressly said of his tried and approved Faith, that *it was accounted to him for Righteousness*. And, after all, if we do admit, that *Abraham* was tried several Times, or ever so often (always in order to some Thing to be

* *Append. p. 153.*

done,

done, or some Favour to be received, *i. e.* to be conferred on him) that does really still make it more, not less absurd, to imagine he was *tried*, after all, again, without any such View, or Occasion, for no purpose.

After you have emptied yourself of all the Objections you, or, for ought I know, any Body could have in store against this one, I must needs say, hardly-treated Argument, you close this Article in these Words: “ Though the common Account of this Transaction will very well stand with the Nature of a *Trial*, it is very fit to be observed, that *your* Account of it will *not*; I mean, in that *full Extent* in which the Scripture sets it forth to us as *such*ⁱ, as I shall prove by and by”. And by and by, Sir, I shall examine your Proof.

Then, taking not the least Notice of any more of Mr. *Warburton*’s Arguments in Favour of his Interpretation of this Command, you proceed directly to object against the Interpretation itself. The Scope, and whole Force of the first of these Objections, is barely this: It doth not appear how *Abraham* could collect from this Transaction, that *Christ* was to be offered up as a Sacrifice, there being no Explanation of it added, which yet, it is reasonable to think, there would have been, had the Command been given to represent this to him. I wonder indeed you should make such an Objection as this. That the Transaction was this Information, rests on Mr. *Warburton*’s Proofs

ⁱ *Append.* p. 153.

of this Point. There is no Explanation added, because this Representation was made only for *Abraham's* Use: And it was unfit the *Jews*, for whom *Moses* wrote his History, should understand the Mystery of *Christ's* Redemption of the World, for Reasons which shall be given in our Answer to your next and last Objection. This, it seems, has its Birth in this Answer to your first; for you say to Mr. *Warburton*: "This, which you offer as a "*Solution* of the Difficulty, is, with me, a "*new Objection* *."

I will not trouble you with repeating what you say under it; 'twill be a full Confutation of it all, if I shall mention any good Reasons, why the Representation of *Christ's* Sacrifice, and Redemption of his Seed, according to the Flesh, and spiritual, was made to *Abraham*; and why it was *recorded*, though not *clearly* recorded. Indeed I have already more than sufficiently performed the first Thing proposed, where I shewed you, out of Mr. *Warburton's* Performance, how reasonable it was to expect, that *Abraham* would be favoured with this Revelation on many Accounts. Nevertheless, I shall say somewhat to it here also: It was one of the very many extraordinary gracious Dispensations of God to him, in Reward of his most singularly eminent Piety and Virtue; in regard to his so extraordinary Worth, God was pleased to grant him the Blessings he conferred on him, both temporal and spiritual, in

* Page 155.

his whole Seed: But these had been no Blessings to him, if he had not known of them; for nothing is a Blessing but what gives us Happiness; and how could the Fate of *Abraham's* Posterity give him any Pleasure, but by its being foretold to him, by an Authority on which he could rely? Therefore God revealed it to him; and was graciously pleased to give him the most ample Satisfaction that could be on this Head, in a most particular and exact Account; first, of every Step, and the Manner of it of the fulfilling of the first and subordinate general Blessing; and then, in due and the most proper Time, of the Completion, and Manner of accomplishing this great ultimate Blessing, to which the other tended, and was only a Means: And therefore, beyond Dispute, he would be at least as exact and particular, with regard to this, as he was to that. He was so; and he gave this last Account in the most engaging Manner, and the best fitted that could possibly be to answer the End of satisfying, and affecting *Abraham* with the Sense of the Greatness of the Blessing represented. Nor did this last Visit, and greatest Favour God ever vouchsafed him in his earthly Tabernacle, want this last Finishing, and utmost Perfection; that no one else ever had been, or ever would be, favoured and honoured with so noble a Representation of the same Matter; nay, very many Ages must not so much as be entrusted with the particular Information it conveyed. But *He* was not only

ly in such high Favour with God, as to be thought worthy (by his Grace through the Redeemer) of it; but there was nothing in *him*, in any Respect, that could be any Bar to its being conferred; but quite the Reverse. He was not to be burthened with a Religion consisting of those numerous ritual Ordinances, which the Temper and Circumstances of the *Jews*, under *Moses's* Dispensation, would make necessary and convenient for them; but which all under *Christ*, were again to be released from. He was of that excellent Frame and Temper of Mind, as not to feel any Uneasiness at the Thought, that the Promises, he was informed of, would not take Place in his Time; but overflowed with Gratitude and Praise of God's holy Name, and Joy for the Blessings, without the least Allay on that, or any such like Account; nor would he fail to make all possible and convenient Returns, not only in his own Life and Conduct, but also in instructing and exhorting others to serve and honour his so great Friend and Benefactor.

But (to use here Mr. *Warburton's* own Words)
 “ The Knowledge of God's future Dispensa-
 “ tion in the *Redemption of Mankind by the*
 “ *Death of his Son*, revealed, as a singular
 “ Favour to the *Father of the Faithful*, was
 “ what could by no Means be communi-
 “ cated to the *Hebrew People*, when *Moses*
 “ wrote this History for their Use, because
 “ they being, at that Time, to continue long
 “ under

“ under a carnal Oeconomy, this Knowledge
 “ of the *End of the Law* would have greatly
 “ indisposed them to that Dispensation; with
 “ which, as a *School-master*, that was to bring
 “ them by Degrees, thro’ a harsh and rugged
 “ Discipline, to the easy Yoke of CHRIST;
 “ God, in his infinite Wisdom, thought fit to
 “ exercise them. But he who does not see
 “ from the plain Reason of the Thing, the
 “ Necessity of the Historian’s Silence, is
 “ referred, for further Satisfaction, to what
 “ hath been already, and will be hereafter
 “ said, to evince the Necessity of such a Con-
 “ duct, in other momentous Points relating to
 “ that future Dispensation^a.”

But tho’, for these Reasons, it could not be
 more clearly recorded, nor the Explanation of
 the Command added; nevertheless there are
 many good Reasons why it ought to be *re-*
corded as it is; whence All Readers might
 know, in general, that it was a Revelation to
Abraham of the Accomplishment of the great
 Blessing of all Mankind in him. *Abraham*
 was the great and eminent Root of all God’s
 Blessings both of his fleshly, and spiritual
 Offspring: Would not then *Moses*, under the
 Influence of the Divine Spirit, transmit to our
 Knowledge all, but especially much the
 greatest Honour the Majesty of Heaven ever
 vouchsafed his, and the common Parent of us
 all? His signal Piety and Virtues, and the
 eminent Rewards they brought down on him

^a Page 608, 609.

were written for our Ensamble, both *Jews* and *Christians*, to invite and encourage all to imitate so excellent a Pattern. Had his being informed of the Accomplishment of the great Blessing promised to him not been handed down to us, all the Reasons given above, besides others, which make us conclude it would certainly be revealed to him, would have much surprized us at not finding it in his History; and we should have been extremely apt to infer God had denied it him. All these Reasons, alike, respect both *Jews* and *Christians*. But besides, (again in Mr. *Warburton's* own Words) “ This Revelation and the like, tho’ they
 “ could not be *clearly* recorded, were nevertheless *recorded* for a very plain Reason : That
 “ when the Fulness of Time should come,
 “ they might rise up in Evidence against Infidelity, for the real Relation and Dependancy between the two Dispensations of
 “ *Moses* and *Christ*; when from this, and
 “ divers the like Instances, it should appear,
 “ that the first Dispensation could be but very
 “ imperfectly understood without a necessary
 “ Reference to the latter^b.” I know you observe “ That the Transaction in Question will
 “ have the same Efficacy to shew the Dependancy between the two Dispensations, whether *Abraham* had thereby any Information
 “ of the Sacrifice of *Christ*, or not^c.” And this is, Sir, what I shall not, nor have I any

^b Page 609.^c *Appendix* p. 156.

Reason to dispute. But I should be glad to be informed by you, for what End you made this Observation. If any good Reason be assigned why the Revelation Mr. *Warburton* makes the Transaction in Question to be, should be no Record, tho' it could not be handed down clearly to us, that is a full Answer to the Objection; That if it could not be clearly recorded, it would not be recorded at all; and that therefore that Interpretation of the Command which makes it to be a Revelation *not clearly recorded* cannot be true; whether that Reason would hold for the Transaction's being recorded on any other Supposition, or not. And therefore what signified your taking Notice it would on yours, as well as Mr. *Warburton's*? This does not prove any Impertinence in Mr. *Warburton's* Answer to the Objection he applied it to. And the same End that it served for him, it is equally useful to against your second Objection, and all you advance under it, in Conjunction with what else has been said on Occasion of it.

I have certainly spoken to every Particular of all your *Objections* both to Mr. *Warburton's* Proof, That *Moses's* History of God's Dispensations to *Abraham*, requires us to understand the Command to offer up his Son as a *Representation to him of the Sacrifice of Christ*; and also to *this Conclusion itself*, which do not properly come in in another Part. And the Issue of all, manifestly is, as follows: Whereas the mentioned Conclusion is by Mr. *Warburton* established on several Arguments and Proofs,

and of different Kinds; you have represented it as entirely suspended on but one of these only; and that of those of the weaker Sort; and which, I suppose, you did not make Choice of to contend with, because you thought it the hardest to be overcome even of these; and yet how vain have been all your Efforts against it! Nor has your Success been a whit the better in your immediate Assaults on the Conclusion itself.

But it has pleased divine Providence so to order Matters, That the very important Truth contained in it, that Abraham's *offering up his Son was a visible Representation to him of the Redemption of Mankind by the Sacrifice of Christ*, is established also on the sure Foundation of the Testimony of Truth itself in the New Testament: For any Revelation to *Abraham of Man's Redemption by this Sacrifice*, is no where recorded in his History, if not in this Transaction. This you do not, you cannot possibly deny: And yet if this Revelation was made to him, you must not deny but it is recorded in his History. Many very sufficient Reasons have been already given for this; besides, our Saviour in his Disputations with the *Jews*, never urged them with any Circumstance of God's Dispensations to their Fathers, which they either were not, or might not be well acquainted with from the Study of their Scriptures! But 'twas in a Dispute with the *Jews*, that he uttered the following Words; *Your Father Abraham rejoiced to see my Day, and he saw it, and was glad*^d.

^d John viii. 56.

Mr. *Warburton's* Interpretation of which Words^e, That Abraham *had a visible Representation of the Redemption of the human Race by the Sacrifice of Christ*, I shall endeavour to maintain against your Objections to his Arguments in Maintenance of it: He begins with assigning the true Sense of the Word *Day* in this Text; and that is certainly the natural Order, first to settle the Matter of the Revelation expressed; and then to proceed to the Manner: However the Reverse of this Method may be born with in itself; and I think it more convenient and proper for my Purpose.

I only premise, that tho' you would not allow this Text to yield any Support or Assistance to Mr. *Warburton's* Proof of his Sense of the Command to *Abraham* from his History as it lies in the old Testament; the Method which this determined me to take of beginning with it, has not been without its Fruits; for what has been done must needs be of great Advantage to his Proof of his Interpretation of this Text; and cannot fail to dispose every rational Person much more readily to admit both all his Arguments, and the Interpretation itself. Not that they stand in need of any Assistance or Advantage from without. The *Greek* Word *Ἔϊδω* does certainly signify literally and properly, and is frequently so used in the New Testament, to *see sensibly*. The Presumption lies therefore on the Side, of this Sense here, till you can bring some better Reasons a-

gainst it, than only producing some Passages where it has a figurative Sense: And I can see no other Issue, therefore of your making yourself the Occasion you did, of asking the Question, and talking and dictating to your great Antagonist as you do, and quoting first an Heathen Author, and then a Text of Scripture for this last Sense^f, if it had indeed signified it, as we shall see presently it does not; than only to shew: That, as before you in vain attempted to confute one Argument which you gave as all that had been offered by him for the Conclusion then in Debate; so in the present Question, only a Word, or two, contained in one of his Arguments, is too hard for you. For tho' you give this as an Argument of Mr. Warburton's for *Abraham's seeing sensibly* whatever was the Object of his Sight in the Text: "The Verb *Ἰδω* is frequently used in the "New Testament, in its proper Signification, "to see sensibly;" you had plainly no more Reason for doing this, than I may have to take any Part of any Proposition, and say the Author means what it asserts, when the whole Proposition affirms a quite different Thing. Mr. Warburton's whole Position, of which the Words quoted by you as all, are the first Part, stands thus: *The Verb Ἰδω is frequently used in the New Testament in its proper Signification to see sensibly, but whether literally or figuratively, it always denotes a full Intuition*^g. This, to speak in Terms of Art for

^f Appendix, p. 139, 140. ^g P. 193.

once,

once, is the Proposition of Mr. *Warburton's* Argument; and which is all that is expressed of it: The implied Assumption, in virtue of which the Conclusion follows, manifestly is; but *Abraham* could not see *Christ's* Day thus intuitively, if he did not see it in the literal Sense: And I believe you cannot say *Abraham* could have a *full Intuition* of *Christ's* Day, which happened Thousands of Years after his Time, otherwise than by a *visible Representation* of it. So unless you can give some Instances out of the New Testament, where the Word in Question signifies neither to *see sensibly*, nor by full *Intuition* in its figurative Sense; this single Argument strongly and most unexceptionably evinces the Point to be proved: But in the Passage you quote^h on Occasion of Mr. *Warburton's* present Argument; it signifies not only to see by full Intuition, but also, to *see sensibly*; it is this: *These all died in Faith, not having received the Promises, but having seen them afar off*ⁱ. The Point in Question between us is, what is meant by *having seen the Promises* in this Text; and this, I think, will best be seen by considering the Expression immediately before it; *not having received the Promises*: This plainly distinguishes *Abraham*, *Sarah*, and the few others, their Ancestors, the Apostle had before mentioned, from *Christians*, who *had* received them. What then are those Promises which we have received, and they did not? You will say: Not God's Predictions, and

^h Appendix p. 140.ⁱ Heb. xi. 13.

Declara-

Declarations of Man's future Redemption and of the Blessings included in it; but the Accomplishment thereof, not the Predictions, or Promises themselves, but, by an usual Metonymy, the Things promised: And these Things, these Blessings were not only obscurely foretold, from the First, to fallen Man; but held out likewise, at least, to all the few *Patriarchs* above enumerated by the Divine Writer, in Types, and particularly in those Types, Sacrifices; which they well understood, and, besides the general Import of them, that, likewise, they themselves should enjoy the Benefit, and delightful Consequences of them in another State. *These all died in Faith*; this is the Apostle's general Assertion of them, that they had Faith in God in the general Sense of that Word he had given above; the Remainder of this Portion of Scripture, both specifies its Application to certain Objects; and also accounts for it. " They did not indeed live to
 " see the Accomplishment of the Promises
 " and Types, to see the Blessings actually
 " take Place, but they were not only fore-
 " told before their Time, but they even saw
 " *visible Representations* of them, of whose
 " general Meaning they were well apprized;
 " *not having received the Promises, but having*
 " *seen them afar off*: And what they thus
 " *saw*, and understood, they firmly believed
 " would, one Day, come to pass; and that
 " in Consequence thereof, they themselves
 " should enjoy another State than this Earthly,
 I " which

“ which was the great Object of their confident
 “ Expectations, their Hopes, their Wishes,
 “ both in Speculation and Practice;” *and were
 persuaded of them, and embraced them, and
 confessed that they were Strangers and Pil-
 grims in the Earth: For they that say such
 Things plainly declare that they seek a Country.*
 Did you Sir, mistake *Sight* for Faith in Bless-
 ings to be received in after Days? Did you,
 Sir, confound the *Sight* here spoken of with
 Faith in the Beginning of this Passage; or
 with *being persuaded*, that is, firmly believing,
 that those Things whereof they had had visible
 Representations should be accomplished, and
 actually take Place?

That our Saviour affirmed *Abraham saw*
 properly and *sensibly* his Day cannot be doubt-
 ed from the Answer the *Jews* made him, *Thou
 art not yet fifty Years old, and hast thou seen
 Abraham*^k; “ plainly intimating, says Mr.
 “ Warburton that they understood the Affir-
 “ tion of *Abraham’s* seeing *Christ’s* Day, to be
 “ a real beholding him in Person^l:” No,
 this Consequence, you say, will not hold, by
 any Means: Why Sir? “ No doubt, the
 “ *Jews* answer our Saviour, as if he had
 “ said, that *Abraham* and *He* were *Cotem-
 poraries*; in which they answered very
 “ foolishly, as they did on many other Occa-
 “ sions; and the Answer will as little agree
 “ with your Interpretation as it does with
 “ mine: For does your Interpretation suppose

^k John viii. 57.

^l P. 593.

“ that *Abraham* saw *Christ* in *Person*? No, “ you say it was by *Representation* only^m:” Why, Sir, you know better than I can tell you, that this is no Answer to Mr. *Warburton*’s Argument, but as mere an Evasion as ever was. The Purport of the Argument is this, That the *Jews* would never have made this foolish Answer, had not the *Syriac* Word, which our Saviour used, expressed seeing *sensibly* as strongly (at least as strongly) as the *Greek* Word “*Εἶδω*” into which the *Evangelist* translated it, does: And is not this Argument as strong as needs be? Had our Saviour’s Word been such and so expressed, as that it might signify *Abraham*’s being told, or believing that *Christ*’s Day would come; could they possibly have been so foolish as to think, that he made himself cotemporary with *Abraham*? Sir, either this Argument, or the preceding alone, had been very sufficient whereon to build Mr. *Warburton*’s Interpretation of this Word; but besides all those which have been already produced, it is not only powerfully supported by that Authority, the full Force of which is so handsomely exhibited by Mr. *Warburton*ⁿ; but also by other cogent Arguments, as will appear both in our debating the next Word, *Day*; and also from the true Sense, which will, in its proper Place, be vindicated, of the remaining Part of the Text.

Mr. *Warburton*’s Argument for the Sense given by him of this Word, runs thus:

^m *Appendix* p. 140, 141.

ⁿ P. 594.

“ When

“ When the figurative Word DAY is used,
 “ not to express in general *the Period of any*
 “ *one's Existence*; but to denote his peculiar
 “ *Office and Employment*; it must needs signify
 “ that very Circumstance of his Life, which
 “ is *characteristic* of such Office and Employ-
 “ ment: But *Jesus* is here speaking of his
 “ peculiar Office and Employment, as ap-
 “ pears from the Occasion of the Dispute,
 “ which was his Saying, *If any Man keep my*
 “ *Commandments he shall never taste of Death*;
 “ intimating thereby the Virtue of his Office
 “ of Redeemer: Therefore by the Word DAY
 “ must be meant that *characteristic* Circum-
 “ stance of his Life: But that Circumstance
 “ was laying it down for the Redemption of
 “ Mankind: Consequently by the Word DAY,
 “ is meant the great Sacrifice of CHRIST^o.”

You answer, “ Really, Sir, I see no Man-
 “ ner of Consequence in this Reasoning^p?”
 Why, Sir, as to that I cannot certainly say.
 But surely this Reasoning is very just and con-
 clusive. You allow the Word does refer to
Christ's Office of Redeemer. Your next
 Words are not very clear to me: however,
 not to stand giving my Reasons for this, or
 commenting on them; at the Bottom of this
 very Paragraph, and a few Passages after,
 you explain your Meaning to be *Christ's*
 Redemption to come, that is, his future Re-
 demption of us. And what now, if instead
 of the Word Characteristic we substitute the

^o Pag. 592, 593. ^p Appendix p. 139. ^a Ibid.

Definition? It is that which constitutes the Thing whereof it is the Characteristic, that wherein it consists: But surely, if the figurative Word *Day* signifies *Christ's* Office of redeeming Mankind, it signifies that Thing wherein his redeeming us consists; it signifies the Act of his Redemption of us.

But the most learned Men, we too often see by Experience, can be sometimes prejudiced; and that that, and the very Strength of their Faculties, can make them as unapprehensive, even of clear Evidence, as Dulness shall others. I will therefore, with your Leave, endeavour at some Variety of Arguments on this Point, that so, if such a thing may be, some or other of them may hit your Apprehension. And the first of these shall be only a necessary Consequence from the Sense, in which it is proved *Abraham* is asserted to *see* in this Text; and your Confession, that what he saw was *Christ's Redemption of us*. I ask then, what other *visible Representation* you think *Abraham* might have of *this Redemption*, but of *the great Sacrifice of Christ*. I believe you will not think, or say you think, but that if *Abraham* had a *sensible Representation* of *Christ's* Redemption of us, he saw the *great Sacrifice* by which he procured and effected it.

Why did God inform him by Action, and *sensibly*, of his Redemption of us, but in order to make the stronger Impression on him, and affect him more deeply with a Sense of the
divine

divine Love and Favour to himself and us? And would he then not give him *that Representation* hereof, which would best answer the End proposed? Would he inform him of his Design to redeem us, in the most affecting Way, and conceal that from him by which he worked such a Deliverance for us, *the Death of his only Begotten*? Affecting indeed Instance of his astonishing Condescension, Love, and Goodness to all Mankind, and to *Abraham* in particular! Inexpressible Source of Gratitude, and Praise, and Thanksgiving, not only of the Lips, but of a Life most ardently devoted to his Service, to his Honour!

These Arguments which I have offered, indeed, stand on the Foundation of the Sense given and proved of the preceding Word. I will try to make out one or two, which do not rest at all on that Bottom. But I shall, in the first of them, make use of the same Confession I did of yours in the last Argument, That *Christ's Day*, in the Text, refers to *his Redemption of us*. Now since, as has been proved by several Arguments above, the Revelation which *Christ* affirms in the Text was made of this Redemption to *Abraham*, is certainly to be found in his History in *Genesis*, I think this Consequence is necessary, that *Abraham* was informed of the great Sacrifice of *Christ*; because no other Part of this History can be interpreted to be a Revelation of *Christ's* Redemption to him, but *the Command* he received to *sacrifice his Son*: But if this Command

mand was that Revelation to him, Prejudice itself, I think, must own, that, no Doubt, he learnt by it, that *Christ* would redeem Mankind by *the Sacrifice of himself*. Now this indeed is what is wanted, that this Command was a Revelation to *Abraham* of the Redemption of Mankind by the Sacrifice of *Christ*; and for the sake of which we are vindicating the Sense asserted of the Word *Day* in the Text. However, I go on and observe, that, since the Redemption of us by the Sacrifice of *Christ* was revealed to *Abraham*, I am persuaded no one will make the least Doubt, but that *the Redemption* our Saviour here expresses by *his Day* means, his Redemption of us *by this Sacrifice*.

The next Argument shall be taken from the Objections of which this Text is our Saviour's Confutation, and its Reference to the Context. As our Saviour, during his Ministry, gave frequent Intimations of his Death, and even Crucifixion, for our Salvation, and, in particular, had told a very large Company, in the sixth Chapter of this very *Evangelist* St. *John*, of the Effect of his Death in all who believed in him, in a beautiful Comparison, in Allusion to the *Manna* with which *Moses* had fed the *Jews*, of his *Flesh to Meat indeed*, and *his Blood to Drink indeed*; so, in this eighth Chapter, in a long Discourse, of which many Hearers were, doubtless, the same he had discoursed with in the sixth Chapter, among several other Particulars, in one of which
he

he has these Words: *When ye have LIFTED UP the Son of Man^a; he thus, on a proper Occasion, delivers himself: Verily, Verily, I say unto you, if a Man keep my Saying, he will never taste of Death^b. This provoked the Jews to the following Reply: Now we know that thou hast a Devil; Abraham is dead, and the Prophets; and thou sayest, If a Man keep my Sayings, he shall never taste of Death. Art thou greater than our Father Abraham, which is dead? and the Prophets are dead: Whom makest thou thyself?^c Our Saviour's Answer is: If I honour myself, my Honour is nothing: It is my Father that honoureth me, of whom you say, that he is your God. Yet you have not known him; but I know him; and if I should say, I know him not, I should be a Liar, like unto you; but I know him, and keep his Sayings: Your Father Abraham rejoiced to see my Day, and he saw it, and was glad^d. Let it be observed, how this Reply to the Words which immediately occasioned it (as it were) gathers up, and collects most, or all the several Particulars he had just before laid down to the same Audience. As how the Honour he attributed to himself, was conferred, and attested by God; and which he preached, and behaved himself, as he had in Commission, and ought; and how unsuitable their Dispositions and Behaviour were to their pretended Relations to God, and*

^a John viii.^b *ψ* 51.^c *ψ* 52, 53.^d *ψ* 54, 55, 56.

Abraham;

Abraham; besides others. The *Jews* Words contained two Objections to the Assertion of our Saviour, that *if a Man keep my Saying, he shall never taste of Death*. The first was the Death of *Abraham* and of the Prophets, who they thought would have been exempted from this Fate if any Men were to be so; and yet were not only deceased; but were even under no Possibility of performing that which our Saviour's Words seemed to make the Condition of not undergoing it: The other was the great Superiority they seemed to give him over *Abraham*. I need not say, the two first Verses of our Saviour's Reply are no Answer to these Objections; but a beautiful and proper Premunition and Preparation to it, contained in the last; *your Father Abraham rejoiced to see my Day, and he saw it and was glad*: Which, besides a just and natural Reflection on the Difference between their Father *Abraham* and them, with Regard to this Point, is a full Solution of both Objections: For if *Abraham* saw his Day, he might not only have divine Faith in general, but also have Faith in his Day, and so be free from that spiritual Death he meant, tho' *this* actual Faith was the *universal* Condition of Exemption from it. I need not add how plain his very great Superiority over *Abraham* was from the Text: The Question between us, what the Word *Day* signifies in it, I think, now will easily be decided: It is plain from considering the Text only with relation to the Objections

to which it is an Answer, and is what you have, and will confess, that it signifies *Christ's* Redemption of *Abraham*, and of all others who believed herein, from Death. But there is no need of insisting on this. What must the *Jews* understand by this Word, *Day*, who had heard all the rest of this long Discourse, to all the other Parts of which our Saviour's Answer referr'd, and included them; to say nothing of *Christ's* frequent Intimations and Assertions, that he came to lay down his Life for the World, and the like? Must not they include in their Idea of it, the *lifting up* of him, which also was one of the Particulars in the same Discourse? Especially surely after his Crucifixion and Resurrection, and the Consequences which the Apostles publicly preach'd thereof, they could do no other, on recollecting this Discourse, than understand by *his Day*, that his Exaltation (like the lifting up of the Brazen Serpent by *Moses*) by which he triumphed over all his, and our Enemies, and delivered all who looked up to him, had Faith in him, from the Malice of the Old Serpent, from the continual warring, and all the Attempts of all the Powers of Hell against us, from Sin and Death. But that which it would of necessity, or naturally convey to them, is the true Sense of the Word.—I may observe, that these two last Arguments amply repay the Assistance the two preceding borrowed from the true Sense of the Word *ἔδω* in the Text. It follows beyond Dispute, from them, that this

Word signifies *seeing sensibly*: Since it is certain that the Command of *Abraham* to sacrifice his Son, was the only Revelation *Abraham* ever had of *Christ's* Redemption of us; and especially of his Redemption of us by the Sacrifice of himself. But if it was this Revelation, it was certainly a visible *Representation*; and therefore, what *Abraham* is said to have seen in this Text, he saw literally and sensibly.

The same Thing also, *That this Transaction was a Representation, or Figure of this Sacrifice*, the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* assures us. *By Faith*, saith he, *Abraham offered up Isaac — accounting that God was able to raise him from the Dead; from whence also he receiv'd him in a Figure, ἐν παραβολῇ^a.* “ A Mode of Information, adds “ *Mr. Warburton*, either by express *Words*, or “ *Actions*, which consists in putting one Thing “ *for another.*” And then shews, that in a Writer who regarded this covenanted Action, as a representative Information of the Redemption of Mankind, nothing could be more fine and easy than this Expression^b. What, Sir, can you possibly object here? Having first craved *Mr. Warburton's* Leave, you begin: “ Sir, if the Apostle had meant by this Expression to signify, that *Isaac* stood as the “ *Representative* of *Christ*, and that his being taken from the Mount alive, was the “ *Figure* of *Christ's* Resurrection; it should “ have been said, that *Abraham* received not

^a Heb. xi, 17—19. ^b p. 611.

“ *Isaac* from the Dead in a Figure; but that he
 “ received *Christ* from the Dead in a Figure.”
 But now, Sir, by your Leave, *First*, on Suppo-
 sition that the Transaction was the Representa-
 tion asserted; *Abraham* did not, and so could
 not be said to receive *Christ* from the Dead in
 a Figure: For this Transaction was a Figure
 of God’s, not *Abraham*’s receiving his only Be-
 gotten to Life again. *Secondly*, it was not at
 all to the Scope of what the Author was dis-
 coursing of *Abraham*, to tell us of *Christ*’s be-
 ing receiv’d from the Dead. The whole Dis-
 course, relating to this Point, is: *By Faith*
Abraham, when he was tried, offer’d up Isaac;
and he that had received the Promises, offered
up his only Son, of whom it was said, that in
Isaac shall thy Seed be called: Accounting that
God was able to raise him from the Dead,
from whence also he received him in a Figure.
 Pray, what had the Apostle to do to tell us of
Abraham’s receiving *Christ* from the Dead in
 a Figure here? But it was very natural, and
 almost unavoidable in him to say, he receiv’d
 his Son from the Dead, adding the Manner in
 which he did so, *in a Figure*, supposing the
 Apostle knew, that to be the true Interpreta-
 tion of his receiving him alive from the Altar,
 which is asserted? No, you say, the Words
 will not bear that Construction. And this is
 your Reason, in your own Words. “ If the
 “ Reading had been not ἐν παραβολῇ, but εἰς
 “ παραβολὴν, it would have suited your Notion,
 “ for it might properly have been said, that

“ *Isaac* came alive from the Mount *as* a Figure, or *that he might be* a Figure of the Resurrection of *Christ*.^a” Why, Sir, you know very well, that ἐν παραβολῇ will bear This Construction ; and that it is accordingly translated in the Vulgar Latin, *in parabolam* : But I cannot, *for my Life*, see, but that if *Isaac* was received from the Altar or the Mount *as* a Figure, or *that he might be* a Figure, then this receiving him was a Figure of *Christ*’s Resurrection ; and that if this receiving him was a Figure of *Christ*’s rising from the Dead, then it was receiving *him* from the Dead *in a Figure*. *Joseph*, when he interpreted the famous Dream of *Pharaoh*, told him, *the seven good Kine* he had seen in that *Parable*, were *seven Years of Plenty in Egypt*. How were they so ? Figuratively, or *in a Figure*, were they not ? Can any Thing be more just and natural than this last Expression, in this, and all like Cases ? So natural and apt is it, that we shall see presently you yourself fall into it, tho’ you so condemn it in *Mr. Warburton*.

However, having, in your Opinion, as it seems, demolished his Interpretation of this Text, by this curious Criticism of ’Εἰς and ’Εν, which steps in so very opportunely in Relief of the foregoing Argument, which so rests on, and is so supported by it ; and also so effectually dispatches that which they jointly attack with a most killing Stroke, itself ; You pro-

^a *Appendix* p. 147. ^c *Gen.* xli. 26, and 29.

ceed to advance other Interpretations in its Place. And the first, whose just, or plausible Title you urge, is this. *Abraham* receiv'd *Isaac* from the Dead, ἐν παραβολῇ, *in a Parable*, i. e. *in a Comparison*, or *by Comparison*^f: Truly, Sir, I cannot see, why *Abraham* may not as well be said to receive *Isaac* from the Dead *in a Parable*, i. e. *in a Figure*, as *in a Comparison*, and why the former is not at least as proper an Expression as the latter. You explain yourself; his receiving him alive from the Mount, was AS IF HE HAD received him from the Dead. Why, Sir, if because *Abraham's* receiving him alive from the Mount, was like receiving him from the Dead, he might therefore justly be said to receive him from the Dead *in a Comparison*; you will be hard put to it, I am persuaded, to shew why, by the same Reason, since this receiving him was like, and made to signify *God's* receiving *Christ* from the Dead, he might not therefore be said to receive him from thence *in a Figure*. He received him from the Dead, *as it were*; his receiving him from the Mount being *like to that*, is what you say. Mr. *Warburton* saith, his receiving him as he did was receiving him from the Dead *as it were*; that Action on the Account of its *Likeness to it*, being made Use of to signify *Christ's* being receiv'd from the Dead by God. Is it because the Term to which the Likeness is referr'd in Mr. *Warburton's* Interpretation, is the Restoration of *Christ* from the Dead; and in your's only, precisely, *rising*

from that State; that it is proper to say he received him from hence *in a Comparison* in yours, but not so in his? Or is it because *Parable*, or *Figure*, besides your Idea, barely of Comparison, includes also its being intended to signify that which it is like? I should rather think, that if there were any Difference in the two Cases, with regard to this Matter, ἐν παραβολῇ would rather be more proper in Mr. Warburton's Sense, than in yours. But, what is very good, these very Words, in the Passage alledged by you in Favour of your mentioned Interpretation of this Text, signify exactly as Mr. Warburton makes them here. This Passage are those Words of our Saviour: *Whereunto shall I liken the Kingdom of God, or with what Comparison, ἐν ποίᾳ παραβολῇ, shall I compare it?* Please to go on to the next Verse: You read thus, *It is like a Grain of Mustard Seed, &c.* There is an *Ellipsis* between the two Verses; and it is this, Ἐν ταύτῃ παραβολῇ παραβάλλωμεν αὐτήν. Therefore, by necessary Construction, a Grain of Mustard Seed, considered in the Respects our Saviour mentions, represents, or is the Kingdom of God ἐν παραβολῇ; be the Sense what it will in which this Word must be here understood. And does it not here signify a *Parable*, or *Figure*? The literal Translation of the last Branch of the Verse is, *In what Parable or Comparison, shall I parabolise, or represent the Kingdom of God?* For a Comparison in one Sense of that Word is a Parable, or a

² Mark iv. 30.

Figure, and a Parable is *that* Comparison. Nor need we blame our *English* Translation, *WITH what Comparison shall I compare the Kingdom of God*, since in Effect this amounts to the same with the other: But when Exactness is necessary, it is to be observed. Our Saviour uttered a great many Parables, or *Figures*, i. e. Comparisons wherein one Thing, by Reason of its Likeness thereto, is put for, or made to signify another. Do not you think, this of a Grain of Mustard Seed is one of these? It is said in the second Verse of this Chapter, *And he* [our Saviour] *taught them many Things in Parables*. What! was not this one of those many he taught them? As soon as it is finished, the *Evangelist* adds, *And in many such Parables he spoke the Word to them as they could bear it: And without a Parable he spoke not to them*. But our *English* Translators happened to render part of the Introduction to one of these Parables, *with what Comparison shall I compare the Kingdom of God?* And this, perhaps too by the Help of the Word *ὁμοιωσάμεν* in the former Part of the same Verse, supplied you with a Phantom of an Argument, at which you catch'd, you see with what Success. In catching at it, you have not only overturned all the Arguments you raised against Mr. *Warburton's* Interpretation of the Text in *Hebrews*; but yours, which you thought you left suspended on this in *St. Mark*, having nothing to rest on, is fallen to the Ground.

But you have in Reserve another Interpretation :

tation. " It may be the Apostle here refers to
 " the Birth of *Isaac*, which was [ἐν παραβολῇ]
 " *comparatively speaking*, a receiving him
 " from the Dead; his Father being old, and
 " his Mother past the Age of Child-bearing;
 " on which Account, the Apostle styles them
 " both, *dead*, *Rom. iv. 19.*^h" It is true, the
 Apostle does, in the Place referred to, style
Abraham νεκρωμένον, and speak of the Dead-
 ness, [νέκρωσιν] of *Sarah's* Womb. But this is
 a much less harsh Metaphor than to style them
 both νεκροί: Nor shall you meet with the
 Phrase ἐκ νεκρῶν, in the Sense contended for by
 you, either in the New Testamentⁱ, or in any
 Author whatever. But perhaps, you will tell me,
 the Apostle does not say *simply* and *absolutely*,
 that *Abraham* received *Isaac* from the Dead,
 but [ἐν παραβολῇ] *comparatively speaking*. Why
 then did you produce this Text in *Romans* in
 this Case? However, I'll believe you, whenever
 you produce me an Instance where ἐν παραβολῇ
 is used in this Sense in any good Author.

Thus have I, very sufficiently, I think, vin-
 dicated Mr. *Warburton's* Interpretation of this
 last Text, and his Proof of it, against you;
 and disprov'd both yours. And I might well
 be excused saying another Word of it. Never-

^h Page 148.

ⁱ See *Wolf. Cur. Phil. & Crit.* on *Heb. xi. 19.* where,
 for this and other Reasons which he gives, he concludes
 in these Words: *Hæc mihi ita cohærere videntur, ut de*
respectu aliquo ad nativitatem Isaac ex parentibus effæctis, h. e.
quasi mortuis, habito, cogitari non possit. After which he
 confirms it by other undeniable ones.

theless I shall add, that it was plainly of no Manner of Pertinence to the Scope of the Apostle in this Place, either to say *Isaac's* being receiv'd alive from the Altar was a *Type* [merely so] of *Christ's* Resurrection; or what your first Interpretation makes him say. But your last has not only this same Objection, common to it with the others; but the Reason which you give of your Preference of it above any, is a fresh Demonstration against it. "You
 " the rather approve it, you say^a, because it
 " suggests the proper Ground of *Abraham's*
 " Faith: He received *Isaac*, at first, from
 " the Dead, and why might not *Isaac* come
 " from the Dead then again? The same
 " Power which quickened the dead Womb,
 " could also quicken the lifeless Dust^a." If
Abraham's Belief that God could raise his Son from the Dead followed and planted itself on this Reasoning, I cannot see any Thing extraordinary in it. Sir, *Abraham's* Belief and Knowledge of God instantly on the very Thought of his Son's Death accounted that God was able to restore him from it to Life again; else, if it had stay'd to take hold of the Consideration you give it for its Prop, it had been weak indeed. But do you think the inspired Author would, when he was magnifying *Abraham's* Faith, conclude the Topic with a degrading Circumstance of it? But now how agreeable to what the Apostle was upon, is

^a Page 148.

Mr. *Warburton's* Interpretation ? I think the following is a just Paraphrase of the whole Article relating to *Abraham*. “ ’Twas thro’
 “ Faith, that when *Abraham* was tried, he offered up his Son *Isaac* ; which was so powerful a Principle within him, that, notwithstanding *Isaac* was his only Son ; and to whom the Promises made to him and his Family were expressly confined ; and which could not be accomplished in him, if he should be sacrificed and finally depart this Life ; yet *Abraham*, on receiving the Command to sacrifice him, determined and set about offering him up without the least Diffidence, asking no Questions, not making the least Delay, or entertaining any Scruples ; as he was firmly persuaded, That God could restore him to him from the Dead : and indeed from the Dead he did receive him, in a Figure, or parabolically ; his receiving him alive from the Altar being a Figure, or Representation of *Christ's* Resurrection ; and which was the Principle and Cause of the Resurrection of the whole Race of Men : And therefore [not only really, but I make no Doubt, but the Apostle had it here in his Mind, that] this his receiving him was both a Pledge, and Assurance, and likewise an Emblem, and made by God to signify, that *Abraham* should, after his Death, one Day, receive him alive again into his Bosom, and a happy Immortality.” In short, Sir, whether we regard the Words themselves ; *from whence*

whence also he received him ἐν παραβολῇ; or the Sense and Scope of the whole Passage; no other but Mr. Warburton's can possibly be the true Sense of them.

What signifies it then, Sir, what these, or those Commentators, which are in every One's Hands, say; of whom you talk under this Article? They are not your *Bible*, I hope. That Sense which they, or any Body else proves of any Passage, *it is fit*, should be received. Nay, the joint Authority of any good Number of them of Name, and especially with other favourable Circumstances, ought certainly to weigh considerably, where cogent Reasons are not offered to the contrary. One of the last, I think, as well as best Performances we have on the New Testament, is that of *Wolffius*, which is entitled, *Curæ Philologicæ & Criticæ in SS. Evangelia*, &c. This very learned, and judicious Man, on the Place now in Dispute, tho' he was not from under the Prejudice of conceiving of this Transaction of *Abraham's* as a *Type*, which Mr. Warburton has so clearly removed, nevertheless agrees with him, both in making it a Means of conveying to *Abraham* some secret Information, whether of the Universal, or of *Christ's* Resurrection; (it was certainly of both, if it was of one;) and also in making the very same Words, which Mr. Warburton doth, to infer this Truth. For after he has confuted all the other Interpretations of the Passage, which he thought worth

mentioning, he thus concludes; (I'll give you his own Words.) "Itaque malim in eorum sententia acquiescere, qui *similitudinem* hanc *typicam* esse aiunt, eo sensu, quo ABRAHAMO omni hoc facto aliud quid repræsentatum sit, quam in re ipsa latebat, five jam ad *Resurrectionem*, five ad *Christum*, aliquando Deo offerendum & ex mortuis resuscitandum, id spectasse censeas. And in the same Paragraph, he gives this Reason for this Conclusion: Idem puto firmari phrasi Pauli ipsa, quando ait; καὶ ἐν παραβολῇ, i.e. *etiam in similitudine*, qua puto innui, præter id, quod *Abrahamus Isaacum* vivum receperit, illud quoque EUM cepisse emolumentum, ut amplius aliquid SIBI repræsentatum simul INTELLIGERET." And for further Satisfaction he refers you to a Treatise of another very learned Name; who does not prove, I suppose, a different Point from that which he embraces. Surely, Sir, 'twere the best Way for you to keep your Arguments and Thoughts (I mean in the untoward Causes wherein you have, in this Pamphlet, drawn your Pen) close confined; since let loose, they are so apt to turn on yourself.

What now remains, but that I proceed to vindicate the important Uses made of this great Truth, to which both the Old and New Testament bear such Witness, against Infidels by Mr. *Warburton*, against all your Exceptions to them? His Application of it to the most effectual Confutation of the *Socinians*, who deny the

the real Sacrifice of *Christ*, stands, I think, uncontested by you.

But he proposed this true Sense of the Command disputed of, in order to illustrate God's Truth by the noblest Instance that ever was given of the Harmony between the Old and New Testament. You say, it will not answer this End ; “ because the Transaction will be “ equally prophetic of *Christ's* Sacrifice, whether his Interpretation be admitted, or not^d.” This Objection bottoms on this Proposition ; That the Nobleness of one Instance of the Harmony of the two Testaments above another, depends on its being more *prophetic* than this other. Now, Sir, to confute this, I'll only point out two or three Accounts, on which his Interpretation makes this Transaction a more noble Instance of the Harmony spoken of, than any *Type* can be : *First*, in his Interpretation of it, this Command was a direct Information of *Christ's* great Sacrifice, of the whole Mystery of it, and relating to it, by Action, and was fully understood at the Time of giving it, by him to whom it was given, so very long before the Sacrifice signified was made, and Christianity commenced. Next, admitting this Interpretation, it is impossible any one should make the least Doubt of the Harmony between the two Testaments, asserted in Consequence of it : But as to *Types*, many, tho' without Reason, as this excellent Author has indisputably shewn, have doubted of the

^d *Appendix* p. 157.

very Being of them, and treated the Supposition of them, as absurd; nor can indeed the Correspondencies between any particular *Type*, and its secondary Sense and View, be so very *completely satisfying*, as a full Proof, that the Action was made Use of directly and immediately to present the same Sense. And again, this Interpretation resolves those hitherto inexplicable Difficulties, which have been so long the stumbling Block of Infidelity.

But against this last Use of it you strenuously set yourself. You maintain that there are no *insuperable* or *unanswerable* Difficulties in the Command on the hitherto received Interpretation of it; and that this of Mr. *Warburton's*, pretending to remove old, creates new ones. Having already taken up much more of your Time, than I proposed and wished, I will be as concise as I well can in what remains to be done against you. However, I shall not fail effectually to obviate and confute whatever you have advanced, in the remaining Part of your Pamphlet; tho' I may not always propose your Reprehensions, or Objections, in Form: And I beg, Sir, you'll observe, That it is by no Means, denied, but that the Writers on the Side of revealed Religion have clearly shewn the Divine Authority both of the *Jewish* Religion, and all *Moses's* Writings, and of this History in particular to be founded on such strong and unexceptionable Evidences, as make it able to bear many and very much greater Difficulties than do still remain in it
after

after all their very successful Labours on them. But Mr. *Warburton* does not confound unanswered *Difficulties* with unconfuted *Objections*. How many Truths are there both in natural and revealed Religion which have been so sufficiently proved, and all *Objections* to them so effectually dissipated, as that no reasonable Man can with-hold his Assent to them; while nevertheless many *Difficulties* lie against them? Nor are they the wisest Defenders of Christianity, or of holy Scripture in all its Parts, who treat *Difficulties* in them, and real *Objections* to their Authority as the same Thing. But yet it is not to be denied but that the Removal of these *Difficulties* is desirable for the sake of Unbelievers. And very well and usefully have they been employed, who have removed (if I may so speak) any of these Offences to too many, from off the Face either of God's natural, or reveal'd World.

I cannot but think *some Difficulties* do lie in the History of this Transaction, and ever must on Supposition of the old Interpretation of it, According to it, God really commanded *Abraham* to sacrifice his Son, not in *Scenery* only: but *Abraham* setting himself with all Expedition and Readiness about it, just in the Instant of Execution, God stopped his Hand, and saved *Isaac*. This he might do either because he disapproved the Action, which he had tried whether *Abraham* would perform without Reluctance at his Command; or in Reward of his signal Obedience. How then
could

could *Abraham* and his Family be fully certain, that this latter was not his Motive ; and that human Sacrifices might not be acceptable Devotions to him ? Might it not throw them into some small Scruples about *God's Attributes*, and the Foundations of *Morality* ? Your pretended Solution of this Difficulty^e, I must needs, and am not afraid to say, is very weak and unbecoming your Character. God indeed, in this Case, as in many others, condescended to act after the Manner of Men ; but in any such Case he never acted like a *weak capricious* Mortal, who does and undoes without Cause ; but if he ever reversed any Decree, or Orders, this Change of Determination was owing to some Reason altering the Case. Whenever he acts after the Manner of Men, he does what is fitting for Man to do, and not such Actions as are the Disgrace of the Doer of them. And therefore (on your Interpretation of the present Transaction) *Abraham* and his Family, as well as all others must conclude, both that God had Reason to give, and also that something, the Effect of Free Will either in *Abraham*, or *Isaac*, or at least, some one else, produced a new Reason, opposite to, and destructive of the first, which moved him to revoke the Command. Besides, when a *Man* through Ignorance, or any Passion, instigates another to any Action, of which his maturer Thoughts repent and influence him to forbid it again, he

^e *Appendix* p. 160, 161.

hardly ever, I think, fails to give his Reason for his Alteration of Counsel, and to press it with Sollicitude; but God did no such Thing in recalling this Command: And therefore your pretended Solution of the Difficulty fails every Way, and has all the Faults that are possible to be in any.

All, Sir, that can be said in full Confutation of the Objection, and very great Abatement of the Difficulty, is this: God's Command, (supposing it to be of the Import maintained by you) does not *certainly* conclude, that it may ever be, so much as lawful for a Parent to devote, or sacrifice his Son, or for any Man to offer any human Sacrifice, unless at the express Command of God, who for ought that *Abraham* could, or any Man can know to the contrary, might have Reasons, in an Instance or two, to command this, or that Man to do it, very consistently with his Attributes, and the Fundamentals of Morality, and with our Notions of both. But yet, still it is not what Man can easily digest, that such a Being as God is, would lay such an Injunction especially on such a Father, with Regard to such a Son, as were the Subjects of this Transaction; and especially, that he should not mention his Disapprobation of the Action, when he repealed *the Command*; even tho' human Sacrifices had not obtained so as they did in *Abraham's* Time, particularly in *Canaan*: And to confirm this, if any Body should be so hardy as to gainsay it, I think this a very pertinent and a very cogent Consideration both to Infidels and Christians,

I

That

That we never meet with any Thing like it in either Testament: God sent indeed the *Jews* to exterminate certain Nations; but they were Criminals and *owed* their Fate to his just Providence, and righteous Government of the World; not to add, that they stood in no near Relation to their Executioners.

But now, Mr. *Warburton's* Interpretation of this Command, not only erases the very Foundation the Infidels can pretend whereon to erect their Objections against the historic Truth of it; every even the least seeming Difficulty is utterly and finally dispersed by it: For as our Saviour, in a Dispute with the *Jews*, would certainly appeal only to their canonical Scripture to confute an Error which they objected to him and his divine Authority; so he quotes it, not like another Man, but like a Prophet, or one who had the Divine Spirit constantly residing in him; adding a Circumstance not till that Time revealed in Scripture, and which was not only very pertinent, and apposite to the present Occasion, but also *most effectually* answers the present Use Mr. *Warburton* puts it to, *the great Confusion* of Infidelity.

Your Father Abraham (says our Saviour) *rejoiced to see my Day, and he saw it, and was glad*^f. It is plain from these Words, that this Transaction of *Abraham's* offering up his Son, “ had three distinct Periods. The *First* “ contains God's Promise to grant his Request, “ when *Abraham* rejoiced that he should see; “ this, for Reasons, given above, was wisely

^f John viii. 56.

“ omitted by the Historian : Within the *second*
 “ was the Delivery of the *Command*, with
 “ which *Moses's* Account begins ; and *A-*
 “ *braham's* Obedience, thro' which he saw
 “ *CHRIST's Day* and *was glad*, includes the
 “ *thirds*.”

The Point in Dispute now is, whether our Sa-
 viour's Words assert the first of these Periods. And
 I shall sufficiently consider all your *Criticisms* to
 the contrary. You say our *Translation*, “ *To see,*
 “ will well stand with the *Greek*, where *iva* is of-
 “ ten put for *ότε*, or *οτι* ; positive as Mr. *Warbur-*
 “ *ton* is, that it always refers to a future Time^b.”
 Pray, Sir, what Authority have you for this,
 that Mr. *Warburton* is positive *iva* always refers to
 a future Time? He does not so much as assert
 any such Thing in the Place referred to by you,
 I am sure. What he saith, is, that *iva idn* sig-
 nifies the future Time, to wit, in this Text :
 And this, Sir, it does, and needs must for A-
 bundance of Reasons, as will clearly be seen
 in the Course of our Dispute. How do you
 prove, that *iva*, or *iva idn* here does not refer to
 a future Time? You produce three Texts in
 the New Testament, every one of which, it is
 true, has the Word *iva* in it : of which you
 say the last is the nearest to the Point of them
 all ; and so, since they are none of them quite
 to the Purpose, I might well be excused speak-
 ing to any of them. However, I will give
 every one of them a Word or two. But first
 of all I must beg Leave to remind you, that

^a Page 610.

^b P. 144.

That we never meet with any Thing like it in either Testament: God sent indeed the *Jews* to exterminate certain Nations; but they were Criminals and *owed* their Fate to his just Providence, and righteous Government of the World; not to add, that they stood in no near Relation to their Executioners.

But now, Mr. *Warburton's* Interpretation of this Command, not only erases the very Foundation the Infidels can pretend whereon to erect their Objections against the historic Truth of it; every even the least seeming Difficulty is utterly and finally dispersed by it: For as our Saviour, in a Dispute with the *Jews*, would certainly appeal only to their canonical Scripture to confute an Error which they objected to him and his divine Authority; so he quotes it, not like another Man, but like a Prophet, or one who had the Divine Spirit constantly residing in him; adding a Circumstance not till that Time revealed in Scripture, and which was not only very pertinent, and apposite to the present Occasion, but also *most effectually* answers the present Use Mr. *Warburton* puts it to, *the great Confusion* of Infidelity.

Your Father Abraham (says our Saviour) *rejoiced to see my Day, and he saw it, and was glad*^f. It is plain from these Words, that this Transaction of *Abraham's* offering up his Son, “ had three distinct Periods. The *First* “ contains God's Promise to grant his Request, “ when *Abraham* rejoiced that he should see; “ this, for Reasons, given above, was wisely

^f John viii. 56.

“ omitted by the Historian : Within the *second*
 “ was the Delivery of the *Command*, with
 “ which *Moses's* Account begins ; and *A-*
 “ *braham's* Obedience, thro' which he saw
 “ *CHRIST's Day* and *was glad*, includes the
 “ *thirds.*”

The Point in Dispute now is, whether our Sa-
 viour's Words assert the first of these Periods. And
 I shall sufficiently consider all your *Criticisms* to
 the contrary. You say our *Translation*, “ *To see,*
 “ will well stand with the *Greek*, where *iva* is of-
 “ ten put for *ότε*, or *οτι* ; positive as Mr. *Warbur-*
 “ *ton* is, that it always refers to a future Time^b.”
 Pray, Sir, what Authority have you for this,
 that Mr. *Warburton* is positive *iva* always refers to
 a future Time? He does not so much as assert
 any such Thing in the Place referred to by you,
 I am sure. What he saith, is, that *iva idn* sig-
 nifies the future Time, to wit, in this Text :
 And this, Sir, it does, and needs must for A-
 bundance of Reasons, as will clearly be seen
 in the Course of our Dispute. How do you
 prove, that *iva*, or *iva idn* here does not refer to
 a future Time? You produce three Texts in
 the New Testament, every one of which, it is
 true, has the Word *iva* in it : of which you
 say the last is the nearest to the Point of them
 all ; and so, since they are none of them quite
 to the Purpose, I might well be excused speak-
 ing to any of them. However, I will give
 every one of them a Word or two. But first
 of all I must beg Leave to remind you, that

^a Page 610.

^b P. 144.

to talk only about ὅτε and ὅτι is of no Importance to the present Point. Your Business is to evince, that the *Greek* Word ἵνα signifies the present Time, exactly in the same or like Construction, in which it stands in the Text in Dispute. In the first of your Quotationsⁱ, this Word refers only to the future Time; in the second ^k principally, but not indeed exclusively of the present, and even of the past. And, what is very observable, accordingly even in the *Latin*, and *English* it may be rendered by *ut*, and *that* before a subjunctive Mood governed of it, in both these Texts; whereas, I believe, you will not say it can be so translated, with Propriety, in either of those Languages, before the *English* or *Latin* Word for ἵνα in the Words of our Saviour in Question, supposing them to refer, as you would have them, to the present Time. Your Instance nearest to the Point of them all, as you say, is in this Passage; *I have no greater Joy [ἵνα ἀκούω] than THAT I hear, or than TO hear, that my Children walk in the Truth*^l: But so little afraid, Sir, am I of any Hurt that this will do my Cause, that I shall remind you of an Instance that is still nearer than it is, as you'll easily perceive on observing the Difference both of Tenses and, I think, of Moods of the Words governed of ἵνα in the one Text, and the other; not to refer you also to a closer Consideration of the Sense in each. I mean where it is said, *Greater Love hath no Man than this, that a Man lay*

ⁱ John xvi. 2. ^k 1 Cor. iv. 3. ^l 3 John 4.

down [ἵνα θῇ] *his Life for his Friends*^m. But it is observable, that there is an *Ellipsis* of the Particle ἵ in the Original, before the Word ἵνα, preceded by a comparative Degree, in both these Passages: In virtue whereof (again) also *ut* in *Latin*, and *that* in *English*, before a subjunctive Mood, are properly used, to signify the present Time in both. I will take the Liberty, Sir, to say what would have been to your Purpose, and what only: And that had been to produce a Text in the New Testament, where ἵνα ἴδῃ, or the like *Greek* signifies the present Time in the same direct Construction in which it comes after a Verb in our Saviour's Words under Debate, especially after ἀγαλλιάομαι, or the like Verb. But you know very well, that this Verb ἀγαλλιάομαι is followed several Times by a like Sense, to that you would here put on ἵνα ἴδῃ; and that in all of them, not ἵνα with any Mood or Tense whatever, but ὅτι is joined to it: And for this Reason the ablest *Critics*, of whom you may see a very long List in *Wolffius* on the Placeⁿ, make ἵνα to refer to a future Sight. Agreeable whereto (as Mr. *Warburton* observed) is the rendering of all the *Eastern* Versions, to say nothing of the best and last *Latin* ones: Nor was, I think, this Reference ever *denied* by any *Critic* before you, or will be by any after you.

It cannot be denied, that it signifies the future Time, if the strict Meaning of the Words ἀγαλλιάομαι and χαίρω be considered. " In

^m John xv. 13.

ⁿ John viii. 56.

" the

“ the exact Use of the Words (says Mr. War-
 “ burton) ἀγαλλιάομαι signifies that tumultuous
 “ Pleasure which the certain Expectation of
 “ an approaching Blessing, understood only in
 “ the gross, occasions; and χαίρω that calm and
 “ settled Joy, which arises from our Knowledge
 “ in the Possession of it.” “ Where are your
 “ Authorities for all this?” you ask him. Truly,
 Sir, he needed not go very far for them. The most
 probable Derivation of the first of these Words;,
 and the Senses given of both in *Lexicons* in
 every One’s Hands, will serve to give sufficient
 Satisfaction to every one that desires it. Ἀγαλλιά-
 ομαι signifies that Exultation of Mind, that
 Sort of Joy which is apt to exert itself in
 Gestures of the Body, such as Leaping, and
 the like. Now on what Occasions is this
 Rejoicing aptest to arise in us? Enquire of hu-
 man Nature and Experience; and they will
 tell you, That these Tumults, these Agitations
 of Soul and Body, are the Effects of the
 Passions of impatient Desire, Hope, hastening,
 and eagerly tending to Enjoyment, along with
 the confident Expectation of an approaching
 Blessing, which what it is, and how great, we do
 not precisely apprehend. But indeed almost all
 Words, in Length of Time, are extended be-
 yond, and varied from their original and strict
 Sense, in their Application to many Objects.
 What, therefore, if the Word in Question
 should, in many Instances in the New Testa-

° Page 616.

αἶψα ἄλλομαι.

° Appendix p. 143.

° From

ment, be us'd in a different and even contrary Sense to the mentioned? Does that prove, this is not the exact Sense of it? But tho' this Word be used ten or eleven Times in the New Testament, it never departs from the Sense given by Mr. *Warburton*, as its exact Meaning. But every where it either expresses Rejoycings on the Account of some future Happiness in this Life, of which perhaps the Cause is commenced that will procure it; or in the great Rewards laid up for our Obedience in the next World; or on our entring on the Possession of them, which besides their so vastly surpassing all that we could possibly conceive, we shall justly and certainly apprehend will continually grow upon us, and be pouring in new Bliss and in greater Degrees, without End. This I could shew by producing the several Passages wherever it is used, and examining them in Reference to the Context where there is Occasion. But it is very sufficient to my Purpose to observe, that wherever ἀγαλλιάομαι is used together with χαίρω in Reference to the same Object, if the former Word does not regard the future Prospect of it, it improves on and expresses the Manner and higher Degree of Joy than which is barely signified by the latter. I'll repeat the several Passages in which we meet with them in Conjunction, *Rejoice and be exceeding glad* [χαίrete καὶ ἀγαλλιάσθετε] *for great is your Reward in Heaven^r. Rejoice inasmuch as you are Partakers of Christ's Sufferings,*

† Matt. v. 12.

that

that when his Glory shall be revealed [χαίρειτε ἀγαλλιώμενοι] *ye may be glad with exceeding Joy^s: Let us be glad and rejoice,* [χαίρωμεν καὶ ἀγαλλιώμεθα] *for the Marriage of the Lamb is come^t: And accordingly, in one Place, where the Word ἀγαλλιᾶσθε is only used, our Translators render it, you greatly rejoice^u.*

I should think it needless to add, that χαίρω in the three Passages produc'd above, signifies, precisely, to rejoice, or take Delight in the known Possession of some Good. Tho' after you have quoted the second of these Texts; *Rejoice* [χαίρετε] *inasmuch as ye are Partakers of Christ's Sufferings; that, when his Glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad with exceeding great Joy*; you thus descant on it: "See you
 " not here the direct Reverse of what you say,
 " that χαίρω signifies the Joy, which arises up-
 " on Prospect?" No, I'll take upon me, Sir, for once to answer for Mr. Warburton that he sees no such Thing: He must have, I am sure, either very bad, or very good Eyes, if he does: For, to be sure, it is the Word in Question in the former Part of the Verse, that you mean has for its Object a Good in Prospect; for in the latter, where it is joined with ἀγαλλιώμενοι, you will tell us both Words respect the same Object in Possession. But you would have us believe we are, in this Text, bid first to rejoice in the Prospect of this same Good to be hereafter possessed by us. Why, don't you see,

^s 1 Pet. iv. 13. ^t Rev. xix. 7. ^u 1 Pet. i. 6. ^w Appendix, p. 143.

Sir,

Sir, that you confound the *Object* here propounded of our Joy, that is, *undergoing Sufferings*, or being in the same, tho' suffering State, *with Christ*; with the *Motive* or Inducement by which the Apostle exhorts us to take Pleasure in that which was the Lot of our Saviour, to wit, *the unspeakable Joy we shall*, in Consequence of attaining to this State of Mind, *partake in his Glory in the next Life*.

“ Be not impatient under, but even content
 “ and pleased with your Afflictions, as *Christ*
 “ also underwent the same before you; which
 “ Duty if you bring yourself to and faithfully
 “ perform, you shall share in his Glory in
 “ which he shall appear and shall be incon-
 “ ceivably delighted and happy in it.” In short
 the plain Meaning of *χαίρω* in all the mentioned
 Texts, is that Mr. *Warburton* makes to be
 its Signification in the exact Use of it. And,
 as may be seen, particularly in that eminent
Critic, Erasmus, on *Luke i. 70*, its three Sig-
 nifications are, in *Latin*, *Gaudere*, *Salvere*,
 and *Valere*; both which last Words, by an
 usual *Metonymy*, express the same Sense as the
 former; the general Idea of both being a De-
 sire of *Good* to the Person spoken to (with only
 this Difference, that one is proper at coming
 to, the other at parting from him) which is
 the same Thing in Effect with wishing him
 Joy.

Nevertheless I shall not insist on having
 proved, as yet, any more with relation to this
 Word, and the other, *ἀγαλλιάομαι*, than only

K

that

that where they both refer to the same Object, the latter always rises above the former, as has been shewn above. And then I say that we must needs confess that our Saviour asserts, that *Abraham first* rejoiced that he *might* see; and afterwards had Pleasure in the actual Sight of the Day spoken of in the Text of which we are disputing, to acquit his Words of a most unseemly Tautology, which otherwise cannot be denied to be in them. You mention indeed this Difficulty; "that, according to your Interpretation, the *latter* Part of the Sentence is " a *Repetition* of the *former*: Abraham rejoiced to see my Day, and he saw it and " was glad, i. e. Abraham rejoiced to see; " and then, saw and rejoiced." But you have no sooner proposed it, but you dispatch it in a Trice, thus, " But such kind of Repetitions are " frequent in the sacred Dialect; and in my " humble Opinion, it has an Elegance here. " Abraham rejoic'd to see my Day, καὶ εἶδε καὶ " ἔχαρει, He both SAW and WAS GLAD^a." I humbly presume to think, Sir, you had not put such an inexcusable Sense on our Saviour, if you had made him say, Abraham *rejoiced to see my Day*, ay, that he did. Repetitions, it is true, are not infrequent in Scripture, and other good Authors: But then they are ever Repetitions with regard to the *Words* only, and not as to the *Sense*. The latter Clause, whether expressed in the same, or similar Words with the former, is always added for some good

^a Appendix, p. 144.

Reason; has something in it besides what is in the other, either with regard to the Apprehension of the Hearer or Reader; or to the Impression to be made on him, or an *Emphasis* which changes the Idea; or as expressive of some Passion of the Speaker or Writer; or the like. But if our Saviour does not say, That *Abraham* was filled with such a tumultuous Pleasure as is apt to rise on the like Occasions, on being assured that he *should* see *Christ's* Day, and afterwards pleased and satisfied by the actual Sight of it, he does not only utter a needless *Tautology*, but the latter Clause sinks beneath the former.

I will just observe, That Mr. *Warburton's* Interpretation, which has now been so fully vindicated against you, of this Part of the Text now examined, is a full Proof of the Truth also of his Interpretation of the other Part, justified against you above. For if our Saviour's Words mean, that *Abraham* had *first* a Promise that he *should* see; no Body, I am persuaded, can possibly be of Opinion that the Sight he asserts was given *Abraham* of his Day, or Redemption of Mankind, was only a *verbal* Information, but a *Representation by Action*; but if it was a *visible Representation* of this Redemption, it was this Representation of it *by the Sacrifice of Christ*, as has also been proved. Indeed you yourself suggest this Argument, when, immediately after having examined Mr. *Warburton's* direct Proof of his Sense of seeing *Christ's* Day in this Portion of Scripture, you

add: " But to do you full Justice, I will take
 " in one Observation more, by which you
 " have endeavoured to strengthen yourself
 " (tho' it lies a little out of the Way) and
 " which relates to the former Part of the
 " Text^b." And then you proceed to examine
 his Sense of the Words last debated with you.
 I do not know that Mr. *Warburton* applied it
 to this Purpose: However it is plain from
 your Introduction of it, that you think it in-
 fers the mentioned Conclusion: And accord-
 ingly, you do not contest the Consequence of
 the Argument; but only endeavour to confute
 his Interpretation of these Words, and the Period
 they prove relating to the Command to *Abraham*
 to sacrifice his Son; on the Supposition of
 which you seem perfectly conscious this Con-
 clusion firmly stands.

Whatever Opposition might be expected to be
 made to some Part of Mr. *Warburton's Divine*
Legation &c. I little expected any from any sin-
 cere and learned Christian to this his Case of *A-*
braham's Sacrificing his Son, and his Interpreta-
 tion of these Words of our Saviour; and the pre-
 sent excellent Use he has put it to against Infidels.
 Whatever, and howsoever just Opinion *you*
 may have of the common Interpretation of this
 Transaction; yet in the Opinion of Unbelievers
 it certainly still remains loaded both with *great*
Difficulties, and *great Objections*. Their Conse-
 quence from it to any real *Objection* to the Divine
 Authority of our Religion, or of the Canon of

^b *Appendix*, p. 141.

Scripture has, most assuredly, been effectually confuted by many eminent Pens: Say also that you were fully persuaded they had left not so much as the smallest *Difficulty* in it; nevertheless, one might well have thought, you would never have opposed an Attempt to wrest from them the very Principle from whence they draw, and cannot but be persuaded to draw their evil Consequences; a most laudable Endeavour utterly to demolish the very Ground on which they erect both their Difficulties, and Objections, and to leave neither of them any possible *Foundation to stand on*. Yes; you have not only, without Reason of any Sort, disputed *his Interpretation* of this Command; but you have endeavoured to destroy the present *Use* he has made of it: But with what Success let the Sequel declare. His Interpretation, That the Command was given to be that Representation, of which *Abraham* had received a joyful Promise, *Christ's* Redemption of us, admitted; you cannot possibly pretend to deny, but that the whole Transaction being, and appearing to him when the Command was given, to be mere *Scenery*, and, like Words, only of arbitrary Signification, it had no moral Import; and that the Formality of that Action which has no moral Import, is seen no Way to affect the moral Character of the Author. This is not only most self evident, but also expressly acknowledged by you^d. But you say, That “ as this Solution removes one *Difficulty*, it

^c See *D. L.* 2 Vol. p. 616, 617. ^d *Appendix*, p. 162.

“ creates

“ creates another.” I take no Notice here how Truth, and Men’s secret Consciouſness of it, is apt ſometimes unwittingly to betray itſelf. For you do not only here (contrary to what you maintain in another Place) expreſſly ſtyle that a Difficulty which Mr. *Warburton’s* Interpretation removes ; but in the Conclusion of your Pamphlet, you drop the following Words. “ It is fit for us to ſtop where Scripture ſtops — and let Infidelity do its worſt.” What are the *Difficulties* which ariſe on Mr. *Warburton’s* Interpretation of this Command ? The firſt you mention is this, That on this Interpretation, “ the Command will not ſtand with “ the Notion of a *Trial*, in *one* Point, in “ which the Hiſtory itſelf intimates it was “ intended as ſuch. You tell us (ſay you) “ that Abraham, *in expreſſing his extreme “ Readineſs to obey, declared a full Confidence “ in the Promiſes of God*, which is very true. “ But you ſay nothing of his *Virtue, i. e.* of “ his *Patience*, and *Self-denial* ; of which “ yet this Command was intended as a Trial. “ The very Words of the Command ſhew “ this: *Take now thy Son, thine only Son* *Iſaac* “ *WHOM THOU LOVEST*. Here are two “ Things pointed at, as ſtanding in the Way “ to hinder *Abraham* from obeying the Command. 1. The Aſſurances which, &c. 2. His “ *natural, paternal Affection*. The *firſt* Difficulty his Faith was to remove ; the *ſecond* “ was to be conquered by his *Reſolution*, and

“ Ibid.

“ *Fortitude* :

“ *Fortitude* : But where, I ask, was *Abraham’s*
 “ Resolution ; if he knew either that God
 “ would not suffer the Command to be
 “ put in Execution, or, if he did, that he
 “ should be instantly restored to him^f.” Do
 not you see, Sir, that the Import of those
 Words, which you make the Basis of this Ob-
 jection, depends on the Nature of the Com-
 mand, and the *View with which it was given?*
 Mr. *Warburton*, agreeably to his Representation
 hereof, gives them the Turn, which will be clear-
 ly seen by my quoting the following Words
 of his ; “ God let *Abraham* feel by Experi-
 “ ence what it was to lose a beloved Son : *Take*
 “ *now thy Son, thine only Son Isaac.*” But if
 your Interpretation of the Command, That it
 was to be a Trial both of *Abraham’s* Faith,
 and also of his *Patience* and *Self-denial*, be
 the true, then you justly represent the Scope of
 the same Words. That is to say, the Words
 from whence you would overturn Mr. *War-*
burton’s Interpretation, and establish your own,
 do effect that End if his Interpretation be false,
 and yours true : I did not indeed expect such
 a manifest begging of the Question from you.
 Not but that the Command did exercise, and
 try, if you please, *Abraham’s* Obedience and
 Resignation to the Divine Pleasure. Else it
 had not so well answered the End God pro-
 posed by it of giving *Abraham* a most feel-
 ing and affecting Sense of his Love, in giv-
 ing his Son for us. The Stroke which *Abra-*

ham did not know but he was to give, and dispatch his Son with, could not but move the natural Affection of such a Parent of such a Child, and strongly strike his Passion, tho' his Faith assured him that if he did deprive him of Life he would soon be reviv'd again. Besides, had not *Abraham* had a very strong Principle of Obedience, and Compliance with the Divine Will within him, his extraordinary Affection for his Son and Heir of the Promises, could not but have begot some small Fear and Distrust in him; and have made him ask some Questions before he proceeded to Action. In one Word, it was with *Abraham's* Faith, as it is with that of all his Children and Heirs; it took Root and grew and flourished, because of the good Ground in which it was sown; and his good Disposition and his Faith mutually influenced and assisted each other in every Instance. But it is certain, that, at least according to Scripture Language, this Command was *no Trial* of his Obedience, or of his Virtue; but only of his Faith, which indeed included several Requisites.

But I must not expect to get over this Difficulty so easily: You quote ^h this Text of Scripture on your Adversary, under this Article: "*By Faith Abraham when he was tried, offered up Isaac; and he that had received the Promises, offered up his only begotten Son, of whom it was said, that in Isaac shall thy Seed be called; accounting that God was able*

^h Appendix, p. 163, 164.

“ to raise him from the Dead.” Why, here is not one Word of the Command being intended as a Trial of *Abraham’s* Patience, or Resolution! I shall take no Notice, that the Apostle does not, as you make him, tell us, *precisely*, that *Abraham* believed God *would* raise his Son from the Dead; but that he *was able* to do this; which Faith was necessary in order to his believing, that one or other of the Cases Mr. *Warburton*, and you after him mention, would be Fact. And therefore, I shall propose your Objection from this Text, not as it ought to stand, to be exact, but as you have put it, and in your own Words. “ But pray observe this, “ Sir, the Apostle does not say, that *Abraham* “ accounted that God would raise his Son INSTANTLY. He might (for ought *Abraham* “ knew, or had any Reason to hope to the “ contrary) be FOR EVER lost TO HIM, though “ he was, &c.” No, Sir, inspired Writers never say any Thing which is impertinent; and it was not at all to the Apostle’s Purpose to say, what you desire Mr. *Warburton* to observe he does not say in this Place. “ But tho’ it was not *his* Business to observe it; nevertheless it is very certain that *Abraham* did believe, that if God did suffer him at last to give the sacrificing Stroke, he would *instantly* restore his Son again to him, both for a Reason given by Mr. *Warburton*; and, also for one which you give, soon after the Words just quoted from

you. The Reason Mr. *Warburton* has assigned, is this: " As by the Command *Abraham* understood the Nature of Man's Redemption; " so by the Nature of that Redemption, he " must know how the scenical Representation " was to end. *Isaac*, he saw, was made the " *Person* or Representative of *Christ* dying for " us. The Son of God he knew could not " possibly lie under the Dominion of the " Grave^k." I need not repeat Mr. *Warburton*'s most just and justly expressed Conclusion from hence. The Consequence must be most obvious, that *Abraham* must needs know, that his Representative would not lie under the Power of Death. Your Reason is given in these Words: " It suits best indeed with your " Hypothesis, to say, That *Abraham* believed " that his Son should be raised INSTANTLY. " For if the whole Transaction was a scenical " Representation, to inform *Abraham* of the " Sacrifice of *Christ*, and if this (as you say) " was the *principal* Design of the *Command*; " the *Information* once given, the *Scenery* ought " to be at an End^l." Very well, good Sir, and I most humbly thank you (tho' there is no need of it) for this unquestionable Reason for the present good Use Mr. *Warburton* puts his Interpretation of the *Command* to. I know, indeed, you would fain take it from me again, and make an Objection of it to that Interpretation, in your very next Words; but neverthe-

^k Page 619.^l Appendix 165.

less I will have it, in spite of them, for my Purpose. These Words are; "And this (that "Mr. *Warburton's* Interpretation of the Command infers *Abraham's* Knowledge that his "Son should not continue in Death) is one Reason among others, why I cannot believe "your Account to be the true one." Why this is nothing, Sir, unless you can give a Reason for it: And a Reason, it is true, you do give, such an one as it is; "because, say you, "it destroys the *Force* and *Virtue* of the Command, considered as a *Trial* of *Abraham's* Resolution, and Self-denial; which nevertheless the very History plainly intimates to "us it was intended to be." Why, Sir, this is the very Reason with which you set out in Confutation of Mr. *Warburton's* Interpretation, and which we have already confuted. I thought you had been reinforcing that Reason with some new ones, or at least with some additional Strength and Confirmation. But I find, we are brought round again, and all is resolved into, and wholly rests on this first Reason. In what a Circle are we? But I desire to be excused going one Step in it with you. You have most unexceptionably proved, that in Consequence of Mr. *Warburton's* Interpretation, afore proved by him, (and whose Proofs thereof, and the Interpretation itself have been effectually vindicated against all your Objections, as far as we have gone) *Abraham* must be well assured, That if he did sacrifice

his Son, God would immediately revive and heal him.

From hence it follows, beyond all Possibility of Gainfaying; not only that “ there was not
 “ the least Occasion, when God *remitted* the
 “ Offering of *Isaac*, that he should *formally*
 “ *condemn* human Sacrifices to prevent *A-*
 “ *brabam* or his Family’s falling into an
 “ Opinion, that such Sacrifices were not dis-
 “ pleasing to him; no more than for the Pro-
 “ phet, *Abijah*, when he had rent *Jeroboam*’s
 “ Garment into twelve Pieces, to denote the
 “ ensuing Division in the Tribes of *Israel*, to
 “ deliver a moral Precept against the Sinful-
 “ ness of pulling our Neighbours Clothes from
 “ their Backs: Nay, the very Information
 “ conveyed by the Command, was, on the
 “ contrary, the highest Assurance, to the Per-
 “ son informed, of *God’s good Will to Man-*
 “ *kind*.” But it also plainly follows how
 weak it is “ to suppose the Command capable
 “ of affording a Temptation to transgress any
 “ fundamental Principle of the Law of Na-
 “ ture; one of which obliges us to cherish and
 “ protect our Offspring, and another to for-
 “ bear the injuring our Neighbour.” For
 since *Abraham* certainly knew either that God
 would not suffer him to sacrifice his Son, or
 else would instantly speak him into Life and
 Soundness again: “ Where was the Tempta-
 “ tion to violate any Principle of Morality in

” *Div. Leg.* p. 618.

” *Ibid.* p. 619.

“ all

“ all this? The Law of Nature commands
 “ him to cherish and protect his Offspring :
 “ Was that transgressed in giving a Stroke,
 “ whose Hurt was instantly to be repaired ?
 “ Surely no more, than if the Stroke had been
 “ in a Vision. The Law of Nature forbids
 “ all Injury to his Fellow-Creature : And was
 “ he injured, who, by being thus highly ho-
 “ noured in becoming the Representative of
 “ the Son of God, was to share with *Abra-*
 “ *ham* in the Reward of his Obedience ? ”

All these Consequences you allow, (and in-
 deed you had been a strange Person, if you
 had not) with regard to *Abraham*, “ who
 “ knew the Secret of the whole Affair, and
 “ that it was nothing else but *Scenery*.” Ne-
 vertheless you have still in Reserve another
 Difficulty: For “ how, you say, this Answer
 “ (to the Infidels you mean) will serve for *his*
 “ *Family* ; who are presumed to have known
 “ nothing of this *scenical Representation*, is
 “ utterly past your Comprehension. I say (you
 “ go on) that the *Family of Abraham must be*
 “ *presumed to have known nothing* of this sceni-
 “ cal Representation, because you have told us
 “ from the very first, that the Information to
 “ be conveyed by it was intended for *Abraham's*
 “ SOLE USE ; and I do not see how *Abraham*
 “ could open to his Family the *Scenery* of the
 “ Transaction, without explaining the *My-*
 “ *stery* ”. I declare it, if you are Dr. S——

° Page 619, 620.

p Appendix, p. 166.

I am

his Son, God would immediately revive and heal him.

From hence it follows, beyond all Possibility of Gainfaying; not only that “ there was not
 “ the least Occasion, when God *remitted* the
 “ Offering of *Isaac*, that he should *formally*
 “ *condemn* human Sacrifices to prevent *A-*
 “ *brabam* or his Family’s falling into an
 “ Opinion, that such Sacrifices were not dis-
 “ pleasing to him; no more than for the Pro-
 “ phet, *Abijah*, when he had rent *Jeroboam*’s
 “ Garment into twelve Pieces, to denote the
 “ ensuing Division in the Tribes of *Israel*, to
 “ deliver a moral Precept against the Sinful-
 “ ness of pulling our Neighbours Clothes from
 “ their Backs: Nay, the very Information
 “ conveyed by the Command, was, on the
 “ contrary, the highest Assurance, to the Per-
 “ son informed, of *God’s good Will to Man-*
 “ *kind*.” But it also plainly follows how
 weak it is “ to suppose the Command capable
 “ of affording a Temptation to transgress any
 “ fundamental Principle of the Law of Na-
 “ ture; one of which obliges us to cherish and
 “ protect our Offspring, and another to for-
 “ bear the injuring our Neighbour.” For
 since *Abraham* certainly knew either that God
 would not suffer him to sacrifice his Son, or
 else would instantly speak him into Life and
 Soundness again: “ Where was the Tempta-
 “ tion to violate any Principle of Morality in

” *Div. Leg.* p. 618.

” *Ibid.* p. 619.

“ all

“ all this? The Law of Nature commands
 “ him to cherish and protect his Offspring :
 “ Was that transgressed in giving a Stroke,
 “ whose Hurt was instantly to be repaired ?
 “ Surely no more, than if the Stroke had been
 “ in a Vision. The Law of Nature forbids
 “ all Injury to his Fellow-Creature : And was
 “ he injured, who, by being thus highly ho-
 “ noured in becoming the Representative of
 “ the Son of God, was to share with *Abra-*
 “ *ham* in the Reward of his Obedience ? ”
 All these Consequences you allow, (and in-
 deed you had been a strange Person, if you
 had not) with regard to *Abraham*, “ who
 “ knew the Secret of the whole Affair, and
 “ that it was nothing else but *Scenery*.” Ne-
 vertheless you have still in Reserve another
 Difficulty: For “ how, you say, this Answer
 “ (to the Infidels you mean) will serve for *his*
 “ *Family* ; who are presumed to have known
 “ nothing of this *scenical Representation*, is
 “ utterly past your Comprehension. I say (you
 “ go on) that the *Family of Abraham must be*
 “ *presumed to have known nothing* of this sceni-
 “ cal Representation, because you have told us
 “ from the very first, that the Information to
 “ be conveyed by it was intended for *Abraham’s*
 “ *SOLE USE* ; and I do not see how *Abraham*
 “ could open to his Family the *Scenery* of the
 “ Transaction, without explaining the *My-*
 “ *stery* ”. I declare it, if you are Dr. S——

I am perfectly astonished at you. What, I see, will not so bad a Cause drive very great Abilities to? Mr. *Warburton* does indeed say, I think, more than once, that the *visible Representation* spoken of was given for *Abraham's sole Use*; and was not that the Case, if it was made to him on Account of the Favour God was pleased to have for him, or for any of the Reasons expressed, and repeated in this Epistle to you? But was this inconsistent with *Abraham's* acquainting *his Family* of the Nature and particular Design of it for the sake of preventing any ill Consequences they might, too likely, else draw from it. You will not, you cannot, say that it was. Does Mr. *Warburton*, any where, either expressly, or by necessary Consequence, exclude them from being made privy to it? Please to take his own Words on an Occasion I need not repeat; (I have quoted them once before in this Letter;) “ The Knowledge of God's future
 “ Dispensation, in the *Redemption of Mankind*
 “ *by the Death of his Son*, revealed, as a singular Favour, to the *Father of the Faithful*
 “ was what could, by no Means, be communicated to the *Hebrew People*, WHEN MOSES
 “ WROTE THIS HISTORY for their Use.” You see Mr. *Warburton* only excludes the *Jews under the Mosaical Dispensation* from the Knowledge of the Mystery visibly represented to *Abraham*. So this Objection, Sir, (for

Truth must be spoken in the Defence of so important a Cause, against any Body) has, most evidently, these two Faults, common to it with too many of your others in this Controversy; to say nothing of the former Part of your Pamphlet; that the Position in which it is founded is most false; and admitting it, your Conclusion will not stand on it. For *Abraham* might inform his Family of the *Scenical* Nature of the Command, tho' we admit, for Argument Sake, that it was *so* given for his sole Use, that he must not disclose the Mystery of *Christ's* Redemption of Mankind, and of the new Dispensation that was to succeed on it to them. Nay, the good old Patriarch could hardly avoid observing to his Domesticks, on the Occasion, God's great Tendernefs and Mercy to Mankind, and Regard to human Relations; forasmuch as tho' the Transaction would, at least, equally have answered the End proposed by it, had he given the sacrificing Stroke he did not know but he was to give; nevertheless when he was about doing it, God withheld him, tho' if he had suffer'd him to proceed, he would have repaired the Hurt in an Instant. Could the good compassionate *Abraham* forbear to inculcate to all he conversed with, all fitting Indulgence and Love to all their Relations, and to all Men, from God's Example in this Instance, and as certainly a most agreeable and acceptable Sacrifice to this so gracious Being? Sir, God so honoured this
 eminent

eminent Mortal, and vouchsafed to acquaint him of all his Designs, which had any Relation to him, not because he knew he would miserably abuse the Favours vouchsafed him, as if he thought he was made only for Himself^r; not because he knew he would *not*; but because he knew that he *would command his Children, and his Household after him, and they should keep the Way of the Lord to do Justice and Judgment, &c^s*. But indeed I needed not have given any other Answer to this Objection, than only, barely, Sir, to refer you to the former Part of this Letter, or that Proposition of Mr. *Warburton's* of whose excellent Arguments under it that is so imperfect an Abridgment; from whence it appears, that both *Abraham's* Family, and also the *Jews* might, with very sufficient Certainty for their Use, conclude, that the Command to him to sacrifice his Son was a Revelation of the great and ultimate Blessing before, in general, pronounced on him; and that therefore the Transaction was only *Scenery* and of *no moral Importance*; with all the Consequences, which, as has been shewn, are so clearly connected with this Truth: Tho' indeed what our Saviour assures us, of which you have raised so long a Dispute above, is of great and eminent Use a-

^r See your *Appendix*, p. 155, but then please not to forget the Answer above, to the Objection in that and the following Page.

^s Gen. xviii. 19.

gainst the *Obstinacy* of Infidels, not to say of others, in this controverting Age.

I think, Sir, I have answered all your Objections to every Part; and that the Consequence from all, is so plain, that I need not set it down. Through the whole Dispute, I hope, I have behaved with that Decency towards *you*, which is becoming the Regard you deserve, and I really have for you, if you are the Gentleman most Persons I have conversed with on the Subject think you to be, for your other Labours in the Cause of God, and Revelation, and his true Religion: Tho' truly, to speak my Mind, I should be very glad the publick Opinion, in this Point, should prove mistaken, and, it appear that you are not the Author of this Pamphlet; not only, because I think it exceeding unequal to the Abilities you have generally the Reputation of; but also on some other Accounts. For to say nothing of your Profession that you do not see how Mr. *Warburton's* Conclusion follows from his Premisses, so well provided in his Two Volumes already published, which is so plain as that almost a blind Man may see it necessarily connected with them; and therefore it is manifest those Volumes are not only what you style them, with much Poignancy, I suppose, you think, a *projected*, but a real and most apparent Demonstration of it: What can be more unworthy of any well-meaning

M

candid

candid Man of Learning, than the malicious Reserve, with which you speak of this another *Locke* in Reasoning, a *Stillingfleet* in Erudition, and a *Newton* in God's moral and religious World? — “that you have given
 “ great Proofs of your Learning and Inge-
 “ nuity, I shall not dispute.” *You shall not dispute!* That is, (for this is the most reasonable Construction of these Words) you have not the Confidence to deny but that he has these Qualities in the most eminent Degree; and yet there is something at your Heart, or in your Will which hinders you from frankly declaring this Opinion of him. Nay, since I have not heard, tho' I have made some Inquiry, of any Compliments Mr. *Warburton* has as yet received from the *Public*; I can hardly look on your next Words^s in any other Light, than as a low and unworthy Insinuation in Discredit of him. His not having, as yet, received any Compliments from the *Public*, as you well know, is not the least Disproof of his most extraordinary Merit; and therefore, there is but too much Reason to fear, you but just hinted it, as not thinking it safe, or prudent to propose and venture it in Form, or more openly. Be you who you will, you had certainly done yourself a much greater

^s And you have had a very fair Time allowed you, to receive the Compliments of the Publick. *Epist. Dissert.*
 Page 1.

Honour

Honour than you ever have as yet, if you had professed the most high Opinion of his most extraordinary Accomplishments, with even all his most eminent Antagonists, who have set their Names to their Works; and with every tolerably qualified, that is not most vehemently prejudiced, Reader, every where. Indeed such is your whole Performance throughout, that even your humble Servant should not have thought it worth answering, but that, a great while after it was published, I heard it was Dr. S——'s, as I thought from good Hands; and was generally, in very good Repute. Thereupon, before I heard Mr. *Warburton* had answered the first Part, I drew hastily, in a Day or two, a very rough Draught of an Answer to your *Appendix*; and after I heard he had made a few Strictures on the other; and the whole Pamphlet wherein they are, was just printed off; I immediately answered this, amidst innumerable Avocations, and in a very short Time: Not that I should have thought much of a much longer, to have been sure of sparing Mr. *Warburton* a few Minutes, which he can employ so much better, for the sake of Mankind, and you from falling again into such powerful Hands, especially in a Cause so clearly against you, whose least Touch you would certainly be unable to bear. I wish your Name when it

candid Man of Learning, than the malicious Reserve, with which you speak of this another *Locke* in Reasoning, a *Stillingfleet* in Erudition, and a *Newton* in God's moral and religious World? — "that you have given
 " great Proofs of your Learning and Inge-
 " nuity, I shall not dispute." *You shall not dispute!* That is, (for this is the most reasonable Construction of these Words) you have not the Confidence to deny but that he has these Qualities in the most eminent Degree; and yet there is something at your Heart, or in your Will which hinders you from frankly declaring this Opinion of him. Nay, since I have not heard, tho' I have made some Inquiry, of any Compliments Mr. *Warburton* has as yet received from the *Public*; I can hardly look on your next Words^s in any other Light, than as a low and unworthy Insinuation in Discredit of him. His not having, as yet, received any Compliments from the *Public*, as you well know, is not the least Disproof of his most extraordinary Merit; and therefore, there is but too much Reason to fear, you but just hinted it, as not thinking it safe, or prudent to propose and venture it in Form, or more openly. Be you who you will, you had certainly done yourself a much greater

* And you have had a very fair Time allowed you, to receive the Compliments of the Publick. *Epist. Dissert.* Page 1.

Honour than you ever have as yet, if you had professed the most high Opinion of his most extraordinary Accomplishments, with even all his most eminent Antagonists, who have set their Names to their Works; and with every tolerably qualified, that is not most vehemently prejudiced, Reader, every where. Indeed such is your whole Performance throughout, that even your humble Servant should not have thought it worth answering, but that, a great while after it was published, I heard it was Dr. S——'s, as I thought from good Hands; and was generally, in very good Repute. Thereupon, before I heard Mr. *Warburton* had answered the first Part, I drew hastily, in a Day or two, a very rough Draught of an Answer to your *Appendix*; and after I heard he had made a few Strictures on the other; and the whole Pamphlet wherein they are, was just printed off; I immediately answered this, amidst innumerable Avocations, and in a very short Time: Not that I should have thought much of a much longer, to have been sure of sparing Mr. *Warburton* a few Minutes, which he can employ so much better, for the sake of Mankind, and you from falling again into such powerful Hands, especially in a Cause so clearly against you, whose least Touch you would certainly be unable to bear. I wish your Name when it

comes to be *known* to him, and the Meanness of my Performance, may not bring that Disaster on you. I chose to draw up my Answer in the Form of a Letter, because we less expect Accuracy and Exactness of Style in those Composures than any others; and therefore I have the greater Reason to expect Pardon for any such Faults in that Respect as, through Haste, may very likely have fallen from me: With regard to the Argument, in any Point of Consequence to the Cause between us, I crave no Indulgence, because I think no Pretence a sufficient Plea for it. And I gladly take the Occasion the Form of my Answer gives me, to subscribe myself, what, (especially if you are the learned Gentleman generally supposed) with much sincerity I am,

S I R, 4 AP 65

Your very well Wisher

Feb. 6. 1743-4.

and most humble Servant,

L. U. P. ---- A. M.

F I N I S.

